

**Library of The Theological Seminary**

PRINCETON • NEW JERSEY



**PRESENTED BY**

The Rev. Mr. Joel Schevers

BX 945 .P3 1886 v.1

Parsons, Reuben, 1841-1906.

Studies in church history

Wm. Draney



STUDIES  
IN  
CHURCH HISTORY

BY  
REV. REUBEN PARSONS, D. D.

---

VOL. I  
CENTURIES I-VIII

---

THIRD EDITION

“That a theologian should be well versed in history, is shown by the fate of those who, through ignorance of history, have fallen into error. . . . . Whenever we theologians preach, argue, or explain Holy Writ, we enter the domain of history.”—


MELCHIOR CANUS, *Loc. Theol.*, B. XI., c. ii.

JOHN JOSEPH McVEY  
PHILADELPHIA

Imprimatur :

✠ MICHAEL AUGUSTINUS,

*Archiepiscopus Neo-Eboracensis.*



---

COPYRIGHT, 1886,  
JOHN JOSEPH McVEY

---

BRIEF OF APPROBATION  
FROM HIS HOLINESS, POPE LEO XIII.

Leo P. P. XIII.

DILECTO FILIO, REUBEN PARSONS,

*Presbytero Neo-Eboracensi:*

DILECTE FILI, SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM!

*Senis voluminibus quæ nuper edita ad Nos misisti, duplicem assequutus es laudem, et utramque merito; alteram alacris ingenii magnæque eruditionis, alteram incensi studii ad Catholicum Nomen ab osorum calumniis vindicandum. Mens tibi in operoso labore exantlando ea unice fuit, ut, depulsis erroribus ex historia quæsitis, facilius qui dissident ad Catholica Sacra adducantur. Hanc tibi mentem, Dilecte Fili, fortunet Deus! Nihil enim optatius Nobis est quam ut omnes unico Christi ovili, quotquot Ejus Sanguine redempti sunt, contineantur. Quo vero officii gratiam rependamus, Apostolicam Benedictionem Nostram, tibi caritatis testem, amantissime impertimus.*

*Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum die XX. Maii, Anno MCML, Pontificatus Nostri Anno vicesimo quarto.*

*Leo (P. P.) XIII:*

(TRANSLATION.)

TO OUR BELOVED SON, REUBEN PARSONS,

*Priest of the Archdiocese of New York:*

BELOVED SON: HEALTH AND APOSTOLIC BLESSING!

For the six volumes which you have recently published, and which you have sent to Us, you have received two encomiums, both of which you have deserved; one because of your spirited talent and great erudition, the other because of your fervent zeal in defense of the Catholic cause from audacious calumny. In the execution of your laborious design, you have had only one object in view; namely, such a refutation of historical errors as would impel separatists to enter into the Catholic Fold. May God second your endeavors, dear son! Nothing is nearer to Our heart than the hope that the One Fold of Christ may soon shelter all who have been redeemed by His Blood. And now, mindful of the privilege of Our office in your regard, we accord Our Apostolic Blessing to you most lovingly, as a testimony of our affection for you.

Given at St. Peter's in Rome on the Twentieth Day of May, in the Year MCML, the Twenty-fourth Year of Our Pontificate.

LEO PP. XIII.

APPROBATION OF  
MT. REV. MICHAEL AUGUSTINE CORRIGAN, D.D.  
ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK.

ARCHBISHOP'S HOUSE,  
NEW YORK, Jan. 22, 1901.

REV. DEAR DOCTOR :

Permit me to congratulate you most sincerely on the successful completion of the Herculean task of publishing your "Studies In Church History." The six ample volumes which, under this modest title, embody the results of your labors, will remain a monument of your zeal, your great learning, and your unflinching perseverance. *Improbis labor omnia vincit.* In these volumes you offer light and valuable guidance regarding all the knotty questions and controverted points of Church History; and you supply an arsenal whence may be drawn unfailingly ammunition for the defence of the Church against oft-repeated calumnies and misstatements of facts. Moreover, with this wealth of erudition in vindicating the truth, there runs through the entire work a beautiful docility to the See of Peter—in fine, that *Roman spirit* which is like a sixth sense, instinctively pointing to what is right, and guarding from error. While I felicitate you on the accomplishment of the greatest literary work ever undertaken by a priest of this Diocese, I thank you for the good example which you have thereby given to your Brethren in the Clergy; and I trust that it may stimulate others to devote their talents and their leisure to promoting the greater glory of Him who is the Immortal King of Ages, and the World's Redeemer.

I am, my dear Doctor,

Very faithfully yours,

*M. A. Corrigan,*

*Abp. of New York.*

REV. DR. PARSONS,  
Yonkers, N. Y.

## PREFACE.

Of all branches of history, none is so pregnant with matter for controversy as that which treats of the career of the Church ; none excites such wide-spread interest, or causes such intense feeling. "Theological hate" is proverbially strong ; and it influences the person of superior culture as effectively as it does one of ordinary attainments. To all who are animated by this sentiment, ecclesiastical history furnishes keen and powerful weapons. But to those who are actuated by simple yearning for truth, to those who feel that the career of a society must show whether it be of God or of man, this branch of science is of first importance. In our day, especially, appeals to ecclesiastical history are not merely of last resort—certain thinking men are influenced by its lessons when they ignore other authority in religious matters, agreeing with Fenelon that "He is profoundly ignorant of the nature of religion, who does not perceive that she is all historical" (*Education* c. vi).

In publishing the following dissertations, we are actuated by a desire to supply a want in our English ecclesiastical literature. Histories of the Church we have in abundance, but no one work which treats exhaustively, and nearly exclusively, of the many controverted points which are of interest alike to Catholic, Protestant, and incredulist. We claim no merit for having thrown new light upon subjects, many of which have been fully illustrated by master-minds, whose writings are familiar to the experienced ; but zeal and conscientiousness have united in an endeavor to lessen the labors of the student in a most

important branch of ecclesiastical lore. We are not without hope that our pages will be read with interest and profit by many of the Catholic laity, as well as by many of our separated brethren; for while we have not designed to produce a "popular" book, it would have been difficult, in a just treatment of the subject matter, to confine ourselves more carefully to the vernacular, and to avoid more rigidly the technicalities of theologians and canonists. All may not be pleased with the numerous references and quotations, which they may deem an encumbrance to the page; but it seemed injudicious, if not absurd, to expect the reader to receive, on the author's unsupported authority, citations and assertions which might affect, and sometimes wound, one's prejudices. During the course of our disquisitions we are too frequently compelled to rebuke such presumption. Again, the experienced student will appreciate the method adopted, and will not regard it as an affectation of erudition. He knows that by referring to the designated authority, he will derive, in the majority of instances, additional and valuable information concerning the matter treated in the text.

We issue our work as a sincere, albeit inadequate, token of our devotion to that Roman Church which the light of history reveals to us as One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic; as the True Spouse of Our Lord Jesus Christ, solely intrusted by the Divine Master with the deposit of truth, which she is to guard and communicate until the end of time.

NEW YORK,

*Feast of the Chair of St. Peter at Rome, 1886.*

# STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### THE ROMAN PONTIFICATE OF SAINT PETER THE APOSTLE.

The occupant of the Papal chair may be regarded in four different ways. He is pastor of the Universal Church, patriarch of the West, bishop of Rome, and a temporal sovereign. As ruler of the Pontifical States, most Protestants would prefer his deposition, simply because they are averse to anything which adds to the dignity of his position. As bishop of Rome, the Schismatics of the East and the Anglicans are willing to recognize him; dissenting Protestants are willing he should be so styled, so long as his diocesans are content with the episcopal system. As patriarch of the West, the oriental Schismatics readily acknowledge him, while Protestants scarcely know of the title. But when the Pontiff asserts his authority as supreme pastor of Christendom, then all the separatist bodies, schismatical and heretical, prelatie and anti-prelatie, unite in rejecting his words. This office of Head of the Church is claimed by the Pope as the successor of St. Peter. The adversary of the Papacy, who devotes his energies to the undermining of this position, is so far logical, and he manifests an appreciation of the value of time. Could the Pontiff be dislodged from it, there would be left him no vantage-ground, the occupation of which would enable him to retrieve his loss. Now, the simplest way of proving that the bishop of Rome is not the successor of St. Peter, is not by showing that he has no legitimate title of succession, not by contending that the wickedness or even heresy of his predecessors entailed a forfeiture of that succession; but by establishing, as a stubborn and eloquent

fact, that St. Peter himself, the presumed source of the Papal claims, never was bishop of Rome—in fine, that he never was in the Eternal City. In many and various ways, the adversaries of Rome have endeavored to prove this, and the object of the present dissertation is to show that the Prince of the Apostles did proceed to Rome, and that he there founded his Primatial see.

The first to cast doubt upon St. Peter's coming to Rome was Marsilius of Padua, a partisan of Louis the Bavarian, and excommunicated as a schismatic and heretic by an express Bull of Pope John XXII. in 1327. From his time to that of the Lutheran movement we meet no author of note who held such a view. The antiquarian Leland (d. 1557), among his many ways of pleasing his patron, Henry VIII., chose the publication of the adverse opinion. The rank and file of Protestant writers have either absolutely denied the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter, or have affected to regard it as dubious. There are not wanting, however, Protestant authors who defend our thesis, and they are among the most celebrated of their class. Such are Pearson, Usher, Young, Hammond, Blondel, Basnage, J. Scaliger, Grotius, Casaubon, Leclerc, Sir Isaac Newton, Leibnitz, Chamier, Papp, Ittig, Schrökh, Bertholdt, Neander, Gieseler, and even the Centuriators of Magdeburg. The younger Scaliger contradicts himself in this matter, for while in his *Annotations to the 18th Chapter of the Apocalypse* he asserts that no instructed person will believe in the voyage of St. Peter to Rome, he contends against Eusebius (1) that the Apostle came to Rome, not in the fourth year of Claudius, but in the second. Basnage (2) and Leclerc (3) agree that assent cannot be refused to the testimonies in favor of the Roman voyage, that only some objections of a chronological nature can be presented, and that the martyrdom of Sts. Peter and Paul, in the reign of Nero, is an incontestable fact. But they hold that St. Peter was no more bishop of Rome than of any other place, and that there are stronger reasons for supposing St. Paul to have been bishop of the Eternal City, than there are for St. Peter's having exercised that office. We shall treat of this

(1) *Animadversions on the Chronicle of Eusebius*. (2) *History*, b. 7, c. 3. (3) *Year 168*, p. 22.

matter when we have established the reality of the Roman voyage. Hugo Grotius, than whom Protestants can produce few more learned writers, says (1), "As regards Babylon, there is a controversy between the ancient and modern interpreters. By it the ancients understand Rome, where no true Christian will doubt Peter to have been; the moderns hold that by it is meant Babylon of Chaldea. I agree with the ancients." Neander (2) says that it would be "hypercritical to doubt the tradition of Christian antiquity, that Peter was in Rome." Among Catholic authors, Pagi, Papebrock, Baluze, Valois, Calmet, Alexandre, and many others, dispute as to the precise year of St. Peter's arrival in Rome, but all agree that he came there, established there the Primacy, and there suffered martyrdom.

We contend that the following events are asserted and believed to have happened, on as convincing grounds as those upon which rests any undisputed fact in history. After the ascension of our Lord, Simon Bar-Jona (son of John), to whom Christ had given the name of Peter, having preached the Gospel in many places of Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, went to Antioch in the year 36, and there established an episcopal see. In the year 42, the second of Claudius, he came to Rome, and there definitively fixed his Primatial see, suffering martyrdom in the twenty-fifth year of his Roman Pontificate, namely, in the year 66. No one disputes the voyage to Antioch, for nothing is to be gained by so doing. As for the Apostle's presence in Rome, the first witness we call is St. Peter himself. In his first Epistle, chap. 5, he says: "The Church that is in Babylon . . . saluteth you," in which place, we contend, Rome is understood by Babylon, in accordance with that figurative mode of signifying, by that name, any great but wicked city, which is in vogue even in our own day. So this passage of St. Peter was understood by Papias, a disciple of the Apostles, for he says, "Peter mentions this Mark in the first Epistle which he is said to have written at Rome; which Epistle he indeed shows to have been written there, when, by a translation of

(1) *On the 5th Chapter of St. Peter's 1st Epistle.*

(2) *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, v. 1, p. 1.

the word, he calls that city Babylon.”(1) That the Apostles sometimes designated Rome by the name of Babylon, we learn from St. John’s *Apocalypse*, for, in chap. 17, great Babylon is said to sit upon seven hills, and to hold sway over the kings of the earth. Now, in St. John’s time, no other widely-ruling city than Rome was built upon seven hills. But why did St. Peter call Rome by the name of Babylon? Why does any man use figurative language? we may retort. But there was a reason, in the Apostle’s case, for not mentioning the place of his residence. He had just escaped from his prison in Jerusalem, and it was prudent, lest his letter should fall into the hands of his enemies, to disguise the name of the place whence it went. (2) Again, it was advisable that the quick increase of the Christian numbers in the capital should not be known, lest the emperor Claudius, who studied to please Agrippa, should more severely persecute them. But if, by Babylon, the Apostle did not mean Rome, from what city did he write his letter? Our adversaries answer, the real Babylon. In those days, there were two places of that name, one in Assyria and one in Egypt. Now, the Babylon of the text cannot be the Babylon of the Assyrians, for we know from Josephus (3) that, a few years before this time, the Jews had all—to a man—been either killed, or expelled from the city. Nor could the Babylon of Egypt have been the place of St. Peter’s residence at the time he wrote his *Epistle*. That Babylon, we learn from Strabo (4), was a small and insignificant place, not worthy the name of town or village, for it is styled a castle. The letter in question speaks of a flourishing church, which would certainly imply a place of some note. (5)

(1) In EUSEBIUS: *History*, b. 2, c. 14. (2) St. Luke used the same economy, when, in the *Acts*, he said that St. Peter went to another place.

(3) *Antiquities*, b. 18. (4) Book 17.

(5) During the first five centuries of the Christian era, not one author understands any other place than Rome by the *Babylon* of the text. Among those who explicitly declare that St. Peter wrote his *Epistle* at Rome, we cite Tertullian (*Against the Jews*, c. 9); Clement of Alexandria (*Institutions*, b. vi., in *Eusebius*, b. 2, c. 15); Eusebius, *ibid*; St. Jerome, (*Ecclesiastical Writers*). Those who believe that St. Peter was bishop of Babylon in Chaldaea, should remember that it has always been the tradition of the Chaldeans that their first bishop was St. Thomas the Apostle, who, after six years of administration, was succeeded by Addeus or Thaddeus. In the *Catalogue of Chaldean patriarchs*, first published in the West by Assemani, and continued to our own days by Guriel (Rome, 1860), we find the name of St. Thomas at the head. We may also cite Martin Luther’s opinion in our favor

St. Paul furnishes us with, if not a positive argument, at least a good reason for supposing the presence of St. Peter in the Eternal City. In his Epistle to the Romans, written, says the Protestant Paley, in the year 53, he speaks of the Church as being in a flourishing condition in Rome. Some one of the Apostles had therefore preached the Gospel there several years before the advent of St. Paul. There are no traces of any other Apostle than Peter having been there, while the Biblical indications point at least to his presence. Again, St. Mark, a disciple of St. Peter, wrote his Gospel at Rome. St. Clement of Alexandria, in his *Hypotyposicon*, says, "When Peter had publicly preached the word of God in the city of Rome, and, filled with the Holy Ghost, had promulgated the Gospel, many who were present requested Mark, as one who had but lately followed Peter, and had his sayings by memory, that he would write down that which the Apostle had preached." Therefore, St. Peter was at Rome. (1)

Our adversaries particularly insist upon the silence of St. Paul as to St. Peter, when he writes to the Romans. When saluting so many by name, he would not have omitted a remembrance to Peter, had he been in Rome. And nevertheless, when St. Paul wrote to the Ephesians, he did not salute their bishop, Timothy; when he wrote to the Hebrews, he made no mention of St. James, who was bishop of Jerusalem. When Theodoret, a most critical investigator, commented upon this Epistle, far from concluding from it that St. Peter never went to Rome, he noted, in his first chapter, that St. Paul speaks of "confirming" the faith of the Romans, because St. Peter had already preached the Gospel to them. "Because the great Peter," says Theodoret, "had first given them the Gospel, he necessarily said

for one of his attacks on the Roman Church is entitled "The Captivity of Babylon." Another reason for refusing to recognize the Chaldean city as the Babylon of the text, may be found in the utter silence of Scripture and of all ecclesiastical writers as to St. Peter's ever having passed the Euphrates.

(1) The following writers also assert that St. Mark was a faithful disciple of St. Peter, and that he wrote his Gospel at Rome, with the approval of the Apostle: Irenaeus (*Heresies*, b. 3, c. 1), Origen (*Commentary on Matthew*, in Eusebius, b. 2, c. 25), Tertullian (*Marcion*, IV., 5), Jerome (*Isaias*, LXV., 24), Epiphanius (*Heresies*, 46), Theodoret (*Epistle 86, to Flavian*).

'to confirm you.' For he says, 'I do not wish to bring you another doctrine, but to confirm that already given, and to water the tree already planted.'" But there was a good reason why St. Paul did not salute the Prince of the Apostles in this Epistle; he was absent from Rome at the time. We know, from Suetonius and Josephus, that in the 9th year of Claudius, that is, in the year of our Lord, 50, the entire Jewish population had been sent into exile. The next year was that of the Council of Jerusalem, at which St. Peter presided. He did not return to Rome until after the death of Claudius, in the year 54. Now, St. Paul's Epistle was written at Corinth, shortly after the Council, as he passed through that city, on his last visit to Jerusalem (1). Therefore, he, quite naturally, made no allusion to St. Peter. A very interesting argument against the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter is drawn from the Bible, as follows: If Peter was at Rome when St. Paul arrived, the latter was very injurious to the former, or else we must say that St. Peter behaved in a very unchristian-like manner to his co-apostle. For, St. Paul, writing from Rome to the Philippians, says (*Chap.* 2) that there they all look after their own affairs, not those of Christ; and he says to Timothy that all abandoned him to his own defence when he was arrested. Further, when St. Paul was entering Rome (*Acts*, 28), the brethren went out to meet him, as far as the Three Taverns, but there was no St. Peter among them. To this reasoning we may say, with Alexandre, that we do not contend that St. Peter was always in Rome, that he was fastened there like Prometheus on Caucasus. His very office entailed upon him the necessity of travelling considerably, leaving the care of the Roman Christians to his vicars, from time to time. But, with regard to the argument taken from *Philippians*, the context shows that the Apostle only alludes to those whom he could have sent on his errand; certainly, he could not have sent Peter as a messenger: "And I hope

(1) That St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans was written at Corinth, shortly after the Council of Jerusalem (year 51), is proved by Origen with the following arguments. It was sent by the hands of Phoebe, a deaconess of Cenchris, a suburb of Corinth. The Apostle calls Calus, who was living at Corinth, his host. In the salutations of *Chap.* 16, he speaks of his companions in the Jerusalem journey, who were with him at Corinth.

in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy unto you shortly, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know the things concerning you. For I have no man so of the same mind, who with sincere affection is solicitous for you." In writing to Timothy, the saint complains of being abandoned by those who might have helped him with Cæsar, and among those St. Peter is not to be counted, for he was placed in the same danger as St. Paul. Another objection is founded on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, 1 and 2, where the Apostle makes no mention of having conversed with St. Peter in Rome, although he tells us of their having met at Jerusalem and at Antioch. But such mention could not be made in an Epistle which was written before St. Paul's visit to Rome. He arrived in Rome in the year 59, and the Epistle to the Galatians was composed at Ephesus in 57, as is shown by the journey of the saint, and by the arguments prefixed to the Epistle in the Latin codices.

The silence of St. Luke, in his history of the Apostles, is also adduced by our adversaries to prove that St. Peter was never in Rome. But this silence is easily explained, and in such a way as to show that it in no way favors our opponents. St. Luke's principal object was the narration of the Acts of his preceptor, St. Paul, and not those of the other Apostles. With the exception of those events which happened between the death of Christ and the conversion of St. Paul, which he narrates as a kind of introduction to his main purpose, and Peter's conversion of Cornelius, which was the commencement of the vocation of the Gentiles, to which St. Paul was specially called, St. Luke, in the whole course of his history, makes no mention of any of the other Apostles, unless where St. Paul is concerned. He is silent even as to St. Paul's journey to Jerusalem to see St. Peter; he says nothing of the meeting of the two at Antioch, and nothing of St. Paul's journey to Galatia. When noting this silence of St. Luke, St. Jerome did not regard it as an argument against St. Peter's residence at Rome; on the contrary, he contended that, because it was certain that St. Peter resided both at Antioch and at Rome, therefore it was manifest that the author of the *Acts* omitted many things

Speaking of the dissension between the two Apostles upon the legal observances, the great doctor says, in his first book on *Galatians*, treating of the second chapter, "It is not strange that Luke is silent as to this matter, since he used the license of a historiographer to omit many other things which Paul performed; and there is no contradiction, if what one man thinks proper to relate, another leaves aside. We know that Peter was the first bishop of Antioch, and that afterwards he removed to Rome, a fact which Luke altogether omitted."

St. Clement of Rome, who became Pontiff about the year 90, was a disciple of St. Peter. In an epistle which he wrote to the Corinthians shortly after the persecution of Domitian, commemorating the glorious sufferings of the Roman Christians, he says, "Let us place the glorious Apostles before our eyes. Peter did not undergo one or two, but many, sufferings, on account of wicked jealousy; and being made a martyr, he departed to the merited place of glory. Through emulation, Paul obtained the reward of patience . . . and coming to the far West, suffered martyrdom under the princes, and migrated from the world. . . To these heroes, who entered upon divine life, was joined a great multitude of the elect, who, suffering in rivalry many contumelies and many torments, were a beautiful example among us." The authority of St. Clement is of indisputable historical value, and is readily accepted as such by Pearson, Junius, Basnage, and other Protestants. But some regard his testimony as defective, inasmuch as he does not explicitly state that St. Peter died at Rome. But it is certain, in the first place, that St. Clement's letter was written in Rome, for the inscription leaves no doubt on the matter, and as such it was regarded by Dionysius of Corinth, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen. The saint speaks of the great sufferings which had been undergone by his people, and which served as a beautiful example to all; among these sufferings, he places those of Sts. Peter and Paul, and the whole context shows that the "great multitude" and the two Apostles were martyred in the same place and about the same time. He speaks of St. Paul "com-

ing to the far West " to be martyred "under the princes," and in such close connection is this remark with that upon St. Peter, that the latter's presence in the far West, and his suffering under the princes, are fully implied. The "great multitude" of Roman martyrs is "joined" not only to St. Paul, suffering in the far West, but to "these heroes," of whom, he tells us, St. Peter was one. The context seems—to us, at least—so plainly indicative of the martyrdom in Rome of both the Apostles, that an attempt to render it more clear appears as unnecessary as it is futile. (1) We have already read the testimony of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, in connection with the belief that St. Mark wrote his Gospel at Rome, at the dictation of St. Peter. Papias was a contemporary of St. John the Evangelist, and probably his disciple, and when he tells us that St. Peter wrote his first Epistle in Rome, his assertion should not be rashly contemned.

St. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, was a pupil of St. Polycarp, a disciple of St. John. In his work on *Heresies*, b. 3, c. 1, he says, "But because it would take too long a time to enumerate, in this volume, the successions of all the churches, we will confound all who, in any way, gather outside the vineyard, by indicating the Apostolic tradition, and the faith preached to men, and handed down to us by the succession of bishops of the greatest, and most ancient, and most noted Church, that one founded and established in Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul." Caius, a Roman priest who lived at the end of the second, and in the beginning of the third century, is quoted by Eusebius, *Hist.*, b., 2, c. 15, as saying, "I, however, can show the monuments of the Apostles. For, whether you go to the Vatican, or along the Ostian Way, you will meet the monuments of those who founded that Church." The testi-

(1) Pearson, Anglican bishop of Chester (d. 1686), answers this objection by asking how Clement could have asserted the martyrdom of St. Peter, if he was ignorant of the place where it occurred, as the objection implies. How did he know that the Apostle suffered on account of his own zeal, and the jealousy of his enemies? Clement therefore knew that the martyrdom took place at Rome, but did not expressly state the fact, as there was no necessity for so doing, it being too notorious to demand mention when the text did not require it. This purely negative argument is so puerile, that a scholar of the calibre of Saumaise (its author) would not be expected to adduce it. Were we to write a eulogy of the late Pope Pius IX., and not state that he died at Rome, it would not be said that we were ignorant of the place of his death.

mony of Tertullian (b. 150) is remarkably clear (1). "Come, then, you who wish to better satisfy your curiosity in the affair of your salvation; look around the Apostolic Church, in which the very chairs of the Apostles yet hold their places, and in which their own authentic letters are yet recited, sounding the voice, and representing the face of each one of them. If Achaia is near you, you have Corinth; if you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi and Thessalonica; if you can trip it to Asia, you have Ephesus; if you are in the neighborhood of Italy, you have Rome, whence we, too, have authority in readiness. How happy is that Church upon which the Apostles poured the whole doctrine with their blood; where Peter shared the passion of the Lord, where Paul was crowned!" And (2) "Nero first shed blood upon the growing faith in Rome. Then was Peter led by another, when he was fastened to the cross." Again (3), "Let us hear what the Romans say, they to whom Peter and Paul left the Gospel sealed with their blood." And (4) "Nor does it matter anything to those whom John immersed in the Jordan, and Peter in the Tiber." Eusebius, in *B.* 2, c. 24, gives us a very clear testimony of Dionysius of Corinth, who died in the second century, and is often confounded with the Areopagite. In an epistle to the Romans, the holy bishop says, "By a certain impulse of prudence, you have placed in one spot Peter and Paul, who first brought the Romans and the Corinthians into the Church of Christ. For both, when they had founded our Church of Corinth, and yours of Rome, and had indoctrinated our souls and yours with the same doctrinal precepts, at the same time suffered martyrdom." Hegesippus, who lived in the first half of the second century, and must have known some of the disciples of the Apostles, says (5), "And returning, he came back to the city, and being taken by the persecutors, was sentenced to the cross. He requested that he might be affixed to the cross head downwards, because he was unworthy to suffer in the same manner as the Son of God; this having been granted, either that the prediction of Christ might be fulfill-

(1) *Prescriptions*, c. 26. (2) *Scorpiace*, c. 15. (3) *Marcion*, b. 4, c. 5. (4) *Baptism*.  
(5) *Destruction of Jerusalem*, c. 1.

ed, or because a persecutor is not unwilling to allow an increase of torture, he was killed by the cross, and Paul by the sword." Julian the Apostate may also be cited in favor of our thesis, for St. Cyril of Alexandria tells us, *B.* 10, that Julian had conjectured that St. John was led to proclaim the Divinity of Jesus "because he found that a large number of persons, in many cities of Greece and Italy" believed in it, and because he had heard "that the monuments of Peter and Paul, though secretly indeed, were venerated." To which assertion of Julian, St. Cyril answers, "John was not led to say that Christ was God by having seen the veneration paid to the monuments of Peter and Paul." St. Jerome (1) tells us, "After his episcopacy of the Church of Antioch, and his preaching to those of the dispersion who were converted from Circumcision, in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, Simon Peter came to Rome, in the second year of Claudius, to defeat Simon Magus, and there kept his priestly chair for twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero, that is, until the fourteenth." And again (2), "I am joined in communion with your Blessedness, that is, with the Chair of Peter, following no other, unless Christ, before you. Upon that rock I know the Church is built." Optatus of Milevi (3) says, "There is a unique Chair, the first in prerogatives. In it first sat Peter," etc. St. Cyprian (4) writes to Rome that his opponents "dare to have recourse to the Chair of Peter, to carry to the principal Church, from which sacerdotal unity is derived, letters from schismatics and the profane, not reflecting that there they are Romans (whose faith was praised by the Apostle), to whom deceit can have no approach." St. Augustine (5) thus urges a heretic, "Even though all, throughout the world, were such as you vainly declare, what has been done for you by the Church of Rome, in which Peter sat, and in which Anastasius now presides? Or by Jerusalem, where James sat, and where to-day John rules? We are joined in Catholic unity to these, from whom your nefarious frenzy has separated

(1) *Ecclesiastical Writers*, art. *Peter*. (2) *Epist.* 57.

(3) *Against Parmenian*, b. 2.

(4) *Epist.* 55, to Pope St. Cornelius.

(5) *Against the Letters of Petilian the Donatist*, b. 2, c. 51.

you." St. Prosper (1) sings, "Whatever Rome, the see of Peter, does not hold by arms, she acquires by religion, being made the source of pastoral honor for the world." St. Epiphanius (2) says that "Peter and Paul were the first Bishops and Apostles of Rome." Paul Orosius (3) speaking of Claudius, says that, in the beginning of his reign, "Peter, Apostle of our Lord Jesus Christ, came to Rome.....From that time there began to be Christians in Rome." Lactantius (4) says of Christ and the Apostles, that "they predicted all which Peter and Paul taught in Rome, and that preaching remained fixed in memory. In it, among other wonders, they declared that it would soon come to pass that God would send a ruler who would punish the Jews and level their cities to the ground.....And so, after their demise, Nero having put them to death, Vespasian destroyed the Jewish race and name." St. Athanasius (5) writes that "Peter also, who had lain hidden for fear of the Jews, and the Apostle Paul, who had escaped in a basket, when they understood they were to be martyred at Rome, did not refuse the journey, but rather undertook it with joy." St. Gregory of Nazianzen (6) says that "Peter and Paul gained their victory in Rome." The poet Dracontius (7) tells us, "In order that Rome might not any longer ignore the benefits of Christ, Peter obeyed the divine commands, and, in company with Paul, went thither." These testimonies, none later than the fifth century, and most of them of an earlier date, ought to convince any candid mind of the historical reality of St. Peter's residence in Rome. Scarcely one of the cited authors has not spoken to the same purpose in dozens of other passages, and we have quoted but a few of the many who are available for our thesis. The reader may consult the following, also not later, any of them, than the beginning of the fifth century, and most of them of the fourth. St. Ambrose (*Sermon on Basilicas*), St. John Chrysostom (*2d Homily on the Acts of the Apostles*), Prudentius (*12th Hymn on the Martyrdom of Sts. Peter and Paul*), Sulpicius Severus

(1) *Poem on "The Ungrateful,"* (2) *Heresies*, 27. (3) *B.* 7, c. 4.  
 (4) *Divine Institutions*, b. 4, c. 11. (5) *Apology for his Flight.* (6) *Poem XIV.*  
 (7) *On God*, b. 3, v. 227, etc.

(*History*, b. 2, c. 28), *St. Paulinus* (*Poem* 19, v. 55, &c.), *St. Maximus of Turin* (*Sermon* 61).

We would now draw attention to the ancient Catalogues of the Roman Pontiffs. The first chronologist in the matter of the Roman succession was Hegesippus, a converted Jew, who, about the year 170, came to Rome for instruction, and while there drew up a catalogue of the Popes. "While I was at Rome," he says (1), "I composed a succession down to Anicetus, to whom Eleutherius was deacon. To Anicetus succeeded Soter, and after him came Eleutherius." It was from this Hegesippus that Eusebius derived his catalogue, and at its head we read the name of St. Peter. The Anglican Pearson asks, when speaking of Hegesippus (2), why he arranged this succession, more than that of any other city, unless it meant something. Towards the end of the second century, St. Irenaeus also wrote a catalogue, and in it St. Peter holds the first place. The authority of St. Irenaeus is great indeed, for his preceptor was St. Polycarp, a disciple of St. John. He tells us (3) that "the Blessed Apostles, founding and instructing the Church, delivered the episcopal administration to Linus." The third catalogizer was Tertullian (4), who defied the heretics of his day to prove the Apostolic origin of their sects as did the Roman Church her descent from St. Peter. "Let the heretics," he says, "publish the origins of their churches; let them display the order of their bishops in a flowing succession from the beginning, so that (we may see whether) their first bishop had, for author and predecessor, an Apostle or one of the Apostolic men. For in that manner does the Roman Church show Clement, ordained by Peter." The fourth chronologist was St. Hippolytus, bishop of Porto, at the end of the second, and beginning of the third century (5).

(1) In EUSEBIUS, b. 4, c. 11. (2) *Succession of the First Bishops of Rome.*

(3) *Heretics*, b. 3, c. 3. (4) *Prescriptions*, c. 32.

(5) In the year 1842 there was discovered in the monastery of Mt. Athos an anonymous work entitled *Philosophumena*, which was declared by Jacobi, Bunsen, and the Anglican canon Wordsworth, to be from the hand of this saint and martyr. The discovery was of importance to the adversaries of Rome, for the *Philosophumena* was a bitter enemy of the Roman Pontiffs Zephyrinus and Callixtus. But he was soon proved to have been a very different man from the holy bishop of Porto, and to have been a heretic of the third century. One of the most erudite investigations in the matter was accomplished by Prof. Torquato Armellini, of the Roman College, and published in 1862. We allude to the *Philosophumena*, because of the following passage in favor of our thesis. In the 6th Book, the author, speaking of Simon Magus, says that he "betook himself to Rome, and opposed himself to the Apostles; he deceived many with his magical arts, but against him Peter made much resistance."

His testimony is found in the catalogue known as the *Bucherian*, from the name of its first editor, and as the *Liberian*, from the name of the last Pontiff mentioned in it. This catalogue was composed about the middle of the fourth century, and, according to the Protestant Mommsen, consists of two distinct parts, one ending with Pope Pontianus (y. 235), and another finishing with Liberius. As we know, says Mommsen (1), that the catalogue of St. Hippolytus ended with Pontianus, we may infer that it is the basis of the *Liberian*. This document begins with these words, "During the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, our Lord Jesus Christ suffered, on the 8th of the Calends of April, in the Consulate of the two Gemini; and after His ascension, the Most Blessed Peter assumed the episcopacy. From that time, is shown by succession who was bishop, how many years he ruled, and under what emperor." After the *Liberian* catalogue comes that of Eusebius, in the *Chronicle* and in the *History*; then that of Optatus, ending with Pope Siricius; that of St. Jerome, as a continuation of Eusebius; that of St. Augustine, terminating with Anastasius; that of Victor, edited by Scaliger; that of St. Prosper, published by Labbe; that of Marcellin; that of the time of St. Sylvester; that of Felix IV.; that of the Vatican, in the time of St. Gregory the Great. The more modern ones we may omit. In all of these documents, authentic as any ever handled by historian or critic, the name of St. Peter invariably heads the list of Roman Pontiffs.

The traveller who has visited Rome with an eye, not bent upon mere sources of pleasure or of distraction, but directed to what can instruct and improve the intellectual man, must have been impressed with the tradition, so vivid, universal, and absolutely held by the people, of the Roman Pontificate of St. Peter. In a dissertation of this kind, we can do no more, at best, than allude to the monuments of the Eternal City, which, from the earliest days of Christianity, have attested and perpetuated this tradition (2).

(1) *Historico-Philological Dissertations of the Royal Saxon Society of Sciences*, vol. 1.

(2) In 1864, the learned Jesuit theologian, the late Prof. John Perrone, published a little book designed for popular, rather than for learned people's use, entitled "*St. Peter in Rome*." Although meant merely as an antidote to the poisons, then as now, being disseminated in

Christian Rome has ever been an intellectual, as well as a religious, city. Nor has its intellectual culture been confined to the ecclesiastical element of its population; its literary and artistic history—and it is fuller than that of any other city in the world—shows that the Roman laity, even though guided and encouraged by the clergy, have ever been capable of, as they were always inclined to, independent investigation. And yet this Roman laity, fully as firmly as any of the clergy could wish, have always believed in the authenticity of the traditions connected with their “holy places,” as they call, by excellence, the spots sanctified by the blood of the Apostles. Commencing at our own day, and going back to the time when Constantine gave freedom to the church, we find a constant succession of Roman writers proclaiming this belief. Nay, further back than that happy day, even in the midst of the persecutions of the second century, we hear Caius praising the glories of the Vatican and the Ostian Way. Nor are the Romans ever disturbed in their proud confidence of possessing the relics of the Apostles, in the glory that the Roman soil was moistened with their blood. No other place ever claims to have been the site of their martyrdom; no other place boasts of guarding their bodies. On the contrary, from all lands there is a constant succession of pilgrimages, on the part of priest and layman, king and peasant, the learned and the illiterate, to the tombs of the Apostles. In the second century, we behold Polycarp, Hegesippus, Justin, Irenaeus; in the third, Origen, Tertullian, Peter of Alexandria. The writings of the first three centuries, Pagan as well as Christian, frequently attest the seizure of persons known as Christians from the fact of their being seen at prayer in the holy places. There was Maurus, an African, who, under Numerian, was taken “at the tombs of the Apostles” in the year 184, as we read in the ancient Martyrology. Sts. Marius and Martha, with their sons, Audifax and Abacus, Persians,

the fair land of Italy, there is much in it to repay the student for its perusal. The author devotes considerable space to the archaeological proofs of St. Peter's presence in Rome, and draws particular attention to the sarcophagi, cemeterial vias, inscriptions, &c., which may be studied in the catacombs and various museums. These objects have an eloquence peculiar to themselves, and while primarily serving to confirm the faith of the devout Catholic, necessarily command the notice of the archaeologist, and the student of history.

were captured while "at prayer," and when interrogated by Claudius, they declared that they had "come to pray to the servants and Apostles of Jesus Christ." St. Paternus, coming from Alexandria, was arrested by the tribune under the same circumstances (1). So were Sts. Tranquillinus and Zoe (2). And this devotion to the tombs of the Apostles has never grown torpid in the course of time. While in the early ages, we discover an emulation in the work of praising the Apostles. Read the words of Athanasius, Gregory, Chrysostom, Germanus, in the East, and of Cyprian, Augustine, Fulgentius, Hilary, Prudentius, Isidore, in the West; we find that the succeeding centuries are no less fervent in the task. It was this firm persuasion that the Roman Pontiff was the successor of St. Peter, that caused Constantine, Theodosius, Gratian, and Valentinian, to give such splendid proofs of affectionate veneration for the Holy See. Equally devoted to Rome, because equally persuaded of her splendid prerogatives, were Clodoveus, Pepin, and Charlemagne, of the Franks; Otho and Henry in the new Empire; Ina, Offa, and Aidulphus, among the Saxons; Demetrius of Russia; Bertrand of Provence; Alphonsus of Portugal. It would be superfluous to enumerate the more modern sovereigns who distinguished themselves by their veneration for the "Confession of St. Peter." And as for pilgrimages to the Roman shrines, their antiquity and universality are too well known to need more than allusion (3).

It has been asserted that the ambition of the Roman See gave rise to the opinion that St. Peter was its founder. In that case, the ambition is certainly as old as the See itself, as is shown by the testimonies already adduced. But, if Rome propagated and nourished that opinion, when there was no historical foundation for it, how comes it that, in the olden times, there was no one to rebuke such audacity? Not one of the ancient heretics, so hotly pressed by the authority and prestige of the name of St. Peter, ever alleged that Rome had no right to invoke that name. Not one of the ancient patriarchates ever presumed to dispute Rome's

(1) BOLLANDISTS; v. 4, *August*.

(2) *Idem*, v. 2, *July*.

(3) The old *Saxon Chronicle* remarks, as an extraordinary fact, that, in the year 889, no pilgrims went to Rome, and Alfred's letters had to be sent by messengers.

precedence on the ground that her Pontiff was not the successor of St. Peter. Even the proud church of Constantinople, in her most arrogant moments, never contested the historical claims of Rome, as deduced from the Prince of the Apostles. In the height of their frenzy, some of the Byzantine schismatics held that Rome had lost her supremacy on account of the "heresy" touching the Holy Ghost; certain others claimed that Rome's jurisdiction had accrued to the "New Rome," on the transfer thereto of the imperial government. But none of the would-be "œcumenicals" ever alleged that Rome had falsely presented herself as heiress of St. Peter's authority. Again, it is a noteworthy fact that, of all the noted writers of the first three centuries, who attest St. Peter's coming to Rome, nearly all are Orientals; very few belong to the West, still fewer are Romans. Orientals were Ignatius, Papias, the Author of the "Apostolic Constitutions," Dionysius of Corinth, Hegesippus, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Caius, Origen, Firmilian, Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem. Of the Western testimonies, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, and Optatus, were Africans; Lactantius may have been an Italian, but he was certainly no Roman; Philaster of Brescia was probably a Spaniard. There remains then, among all these witnesses, only one who was certainly a Roman, Pope Clement I. This preponderance of foreign testimony would certainly indicate some other origin than Roman ambition for the assertion we defend.

Many historical writers have lamented the fact of their being so frequently obliged to wrestle with difficulties of chronology. Few suffer so much from this matter as he who devotes himself to ecclesiastical history. To say nothing of the chronological mysteries of the Old Dispensation, one is taken aback on being confronted by such, at the very outset of one's investigations into the history of the New. And yet, because learned critics cannot satisfy him as to the precise year in which Christ was born, the student does not rush to the conclusion that the Word did not become man. So, in the matter of the present question of St. Peter's Roman Pontificate, our adversaries should not claim a verdict be-

cause our witnesses differ as to the date of St. Peter's arrival in the Eternal City. It is true that Lactantius asserts that the Apostle entered Rome "during the reign of Nero;" that Orosius assigns as the date, "the beginning of the reign of Claudius;" that St. Jerome puts it down as "the second year of Claudius;" that the *Book of Dates* ascribes it to the fourth year of the same. But the dissension among these authors, Lactantius excepted, is more apparent than real. Is not the "second year of Claudius" of St. Jerome very easily reconciled with the "beginning of the reign" assigned by Orosius (1)? The erudite have no confidence in the chronological authority of the *Book of Dates*. As for Lactantius, he is alone in his opinion, but he is as firm as any other author in the assertion that St. Peter was martyred at Rome. His words are (2), "During the reign of Nero, Peter came to Rome, and having performed, by the power of God, certain miracles, he converted many to justice, and established for God a faithful and permanent temple. When Nero heard of this, and learned that, not only at Rome, but everywhere, multitudes were abandoning the worship of the idols and, despising antiquity, were passing to the new religion, execrable and cruel tyrant as he was, he rushed to the destruction of the heavenly temple, and to the abolition of justice, and becoming the first persecutor of the servants of God, he fastened Peter to the cross, and also killed Paul."

Claude de Saumaise (3) contended that St. Peter could never have been in Rome, because St. Paul declares that he himself was the Apostle of the Gentiles, while St. Peter was accredited to the children of the Circumcision. Alexandre allows St. Jerome to answer this difficulty. Commenting upon the text, *Gal., c. 2, v. 7, 8, and 9*, the holy doctor says, "Did Peter therefore, when he met any Gentiles, not lead them to the faith? And if Paul encountered any of these

(1) The arrival of St. Peter in Rome during the second year of Claudius, is asserted by Eusebius (*Chronicle*), St. Jerome (*Church Writers*), Ado of Vienne (*Martyrology*), with them agree those who say the Apostle was martyred in Nero's 14th year, after ruling for 25 years, viz., Damasus, Isidore, Bede, and others.

(2) *Deaths of the Persecutors*.

(3) A famous French Protestant scholar of the 17th century. His "Defense of Charles I.," written to please Charles II., then a refugee in Holland, was the occasion of Milton's issuing his "Defence of the English People."

of the Circumcision, did he not impel them to the Baptism of Christ? This question is answered, if we say that each (Apostle) received a principal commission in regard to the Jews and Gentiles; so that they who defended the Law might have one to follow, and they who preferred Grace to the Law, might not want a teacher, and a forerunner. However, they had this in common, that they should establish a Church for Christ from among all peoples. For we read that the Gentile Cornelius was baptized by St. Peter, and that Christ was very often preached by Paul in the synagogue of the Jews." And does not St. Peter himself answer the objection of Saumaise when he tells his colleagues in the Council of Jerusalem that God had decreed that the Gentiles should hear the Gospel by his mouth (1)? And even though St. Peter had been commissioned to preach only to the Jews, it by no means follows that he did not go to Rome. We know that the Eternal City contained, at that time, a large Jewish population (2); why should not St. Peter have gone there to evangelize it? But the special credential to the Jews given to St. Peter cannot be understood as implying an exclusion of jurisdiction over the Gentiles. However, as this matter does not, properly speaking, pertain to the historical domain, we shall dismiss it with the remark that no Christian denies the universal jurisdiction of our Lord, and yet He is specially designated as "Minister of the Circumcision."

We come now to the nature of the office exercised by our Apostle at Rome. Samuel Basnage, Leclerc, and very many other Protestant authors, contend that, while it is certain that St. Peter died at Rome, it cannot be shown that he was bishop of that city. Some indeed hold that he exercised episcopal authority, but they uphold, on the part of St. Paul, a

(1) *Acts*, 15, 7.

(2) Josephus tells us, *b.* 17, *c.* 12, that after the death of Herod, when an embassy of the "Libertine" synagogue at Jerusalem was sent to Rome, "more than eight thousand of the Jews in the city received them." Philo, in his *Legation to Caligula*, testifies that Augustus allowed the Jews to exclusively occupy a large quarter in the city. Tacitus says that, in the sixth year of Tiberius, four thousand Jews were carried to the island of Sardinia, and the rest ordered to leave Italy unless, by a certain day, they abandoned their religion. After this expulsion, the Jews soon returned to Rome, for after the death of Sejanus, their enemy, Tiberius favored them. Under Claudius, they were so numerous that Dio says the emperor feared to use force against them; he finally did expel them, but the edict was revoked, perhaps by himself, perhaps by Nero, and under the latter emperor, they were so secure and happy, that they could publicly celebrate their festivals. See Persius; *Satire* 5.

joint jurisdiction. Others go so far as to assert the incompatibility of the Apostolate with a tenure of a particular episcopal see. There would be some truth in this last assertion, if we did not know that when St. Peter's Apostolic duties called him from his special diocese, he left its care to a vicar (1). In order to prove the Roman episcopacy of St. Peter, it is not necessary to go beyond the testimonies already adduced to prove his residence in Rome, for they nearly all speak of him as Rome's first bishop. But with regard to the joint jurisdiction claimed for St. Paul, the assertion merits special consideration. Many of the fathers seem to regard St. Paul as the equal of St. Peter; and, to this day, the Roman Pontiff issues his decrees, indulgences, &c., "By the authority of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and our own." Again, on the seals of the Pontifical Diplomas, we always find the effigies of the two Apostles, with no discrimination as to the post of honor; sometimes one is on the right, sometimes the other. All these things appear to show a perfect equality between Sts. Peter and Paul. Indeed, there have been Catholic writers who contended that St. Paul was a colleague of St. Peter in the Roman Episcopacy. We remark, before we proceed to an analysis of these objections, that while some Catholic authors have held that St. Paul exercised in Rome a co-jurisdiction with St. Peter, all agree in the teaching of Pope Innocent X., when, in 1647, he condemned as heretical the proposition asserting "a perfect equality between St. Peter and St. Paul, without a subordination and subjection of St. Paul to St. Peter, in the supreme power and government of the Universal Church" (2). If we carefully attend to the manifest sense of the passages of the fathers which are alleged to assert the equality of the two Apostles, we shall find that they do not militate for our opponents.

(1) EPIPHANIUS: *Heresies*, 27.

(2) The First declaration of St. Paul's entire equality with St. Peter seems to have been made by Claude of Turin, a Spaniard, seated in that episcopal chair in 823, by Louis the Compliant. This prelate is praised by Basnage and Mosheim as one of the forerunners of Protestantism, and is called by them the founder of the Waldenses of Piedmont. But if Claude left any followers in the Piedmontese valleys, history makes no mention of them until 1185. Again, when Pope Lucius III. condemned the Waldensian errors, he made no mention of the chief doctrines of Claude, Nestorianism, and Adoptianism. However, we do not deny that Claude was a heretic; for, besides these two errors, he made war on devotion to the Saints and declared that only a virtuous priest could validly officiate.

Thus St. Irenaeus (1) is introduced, saying that "The Roman Church was instituted and founded by the holy Apostles Peter and Paul." But how does it follow from this that St. Paul was a co-governor of that church, and much less of the Church Universal? St. Epiphanius (2) tells us that "at Rome Peter and Paul were the first Apostles, as well as Bishops." Alexandre concedes the truth of this assertion, if it be taken as regarding the local episcopacy of Rome, and that Epiphanius spoke only of that, and not of the government of the whole Church, is evident from the saint's object at the time he wrote the words. He wished to show that the particular Church of Rome had always preserved the purity of doctrine, and that, to learn what was sound teaching, it was only necessary to recur to Rome, which had been indoctrinated by Sts. Peter and Paul. St. Paul may have been a co-bishop in Rome with St. Peter, on account of his Apostolate, which certainly gave episcopal right and power, but there is nothing in the quoted passage of Epiphanius to show that St. Paul was ordinary in Rome, much less that he shared the supreme Pontificate. Nay, the context shows that he regarded St. Peter as the ordinary, for he particularly notes that St. Clement was consecrated by St. Peter. And in another place (3), Epiphanius deems St. Paul deserving of eulogy, since "Peter, the prince of the Apostles, who was worthy of receiving the keys of the Kingdom, gave him the right hand." And the holy father must have been conversant with the history of Novatianism and Donatism, and one of the most salient facts in the annals of these heresies, is the persuasion of the Romans that no diocese could have two ordinaries. St. Cyril of Jerusalem has also been cited in favor of St. Paul's co-papacy, it being alleged that he always speaks of the two apostles as "Heads" of the Church. This is not correct. The saint uses the word *prostata*, "prelate"; and when he speaks of St. Peter by himself, he terms him *protoprostata*, "first prelate." St. John Chrysostom (4) is also brought forward, since he styles both Apostles the "eyes of Rome," and the "leaders of the saints." But cer-

(1) *Heresies*, c. 3. (2) *Heresies*, 27. (3) *Ancorato*. (4) *Homily 32, on Epist. Rom.*

tainly there is here no implication of equal authority. We might call St. Gregory VII. and St. Peter Damian the "eyes of Rome" in their day, or St. Francis de Sales and St. Jane de Chantal the "eyes of Savoy," but no one would accuse us of investing St. Damian with the tiara, or of making the holy Chantal bishop of Annecy. Pope St. Leo I. (1) calls Sts. Peter and Paul "the fathers and pastors of the Roman city," and rightly, but that he did not recognize them as equals, he proves in the same sermon, when he says that Rome "has been made head of the world through the see of Blessed Peter."

The attempt to make the Roman Pontiffs testify to the equality of authority in Sts. Peter and Paul is no more successful than the torturing of the fathers to that end. It is true that the Popes style themselves "successors of the Blessed Peter and Paul," but St. Bernard, when addressing his quondam disciple, Eugene III., understood the sense of this expression, when he said "Thou art the Prince of Bishops; thou art the heir of the Apostles." When the Pontiff uses this phrase, he means not a personal succession, which is derived only from St. Peter, but a succession to all the rights and privileges of the Apostles, in which sense he is sometimes called the successor of all the Apostles.

The Pontiffs certainly invoke the "authority of Sts. Peter and Paul," when issuing decrees, etc., but they also invoke that "of all the saints;" in some decrees, the authority "of the Blessed Virgin" is mentioned in the same preamble. Patronage, and intercessory power, is here indicated; not any office of authority. In an epistle of Alexander II. (1061-1073), all of these invocations occur; and, in the decrees, etc., of the more modern Popes, they are all very frequently read. It is plain then that all, that of God, of Mary, of Peter, of Paul, and of all the saints, cannot be adopted as indicating the same authority. Had the Pontiffs ever regarded themselves as the successors of St. Paul in the same sense as they were of St. Peter, they would have treated the former with the same respect that they gave the latter, that is, not one of them would have presumed to take his

(1) *Sermon I. on the Feast of the Apostles.*

name. There have been five Popes called Paul, only one Peter. Again, if the Popes are successors of St. Paul, or thought themselves such, the last Pope Paul would have been called not Paul V., but Paul VI.

The argument drawn from the seals of Pontifical documents proves nothing against the undivided Roman episcopacy of St. Peter. In the first place, the more important documents are sealed with the "ring of the fisherman," which bears only the image of St. Peter. Again, even if the Pontifical seal were always engraved with the image of each Apostle, and with St. Paul always at the right, there could be no conclusion in the premises, for the right is not necessarily the post of honor in the Church (1).

Before bringing this dissertation to an end, we would draw attention to some events, in the early history of the Church, which certainly show that our ancestors in the faith were fully persuaded that the Bishops of Rome were the successors of St. Peter. The first event is the famous Paschal controversy which agitated the Church from the days of Pope Anicetus, culminated under Pope Victor I. (193-202), and was finally settled by the Council of Nice. We shall treat this matter in detail in its proper place; for our present purpose it is sufficient to note that the Roman Pontiffs, following the tradition received from St. Peter, wished that the entire Church should celebrate Easter on the Sunday after the 14th moon of the Spring equinox, whereas the churches of Asia Minor, following, they alleged, the instructions of St. John, ate the Paschal lamb on the evening of the fourteenth day, and kept the feast of the Resurrection three days afterwards. Hence, it came to pass that, when the fourteenth happened to fall on any other day than Thursday, Easter could not be celebrated on Sunday the proper day. The want of uniformity was productive of scandal, for while one church was feasting, another was clad in the habiliments of woe. The controversy, as we shall see, soon approached the region of dogma, and it became necessary that Rome should interfere in

(1) For proofs of this non-discrimination of right and left, in matter of precedence in the Church, as well as for St. Peter Damian's opinion as to why St. Paul is often placed at the right, see ALEXANDRE, *1st Cent.*, *Dissert. IV.*, *Prop. 4.*

the interests, not only of uniformity, but of truth. Pope Victor ordered Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, to convene a Synod of all the bishops of Asia Minor, and to inform them of the Pontifical resolve to excommunicate all recalcitrants in the Paschal matter. Polycrates obeyed. Now, in the supposition of our adversaries, that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of St. Peter, that, in fine, his authority is no greater than that of any other bishop, Polycrates, deeply attached to the Asiatic tradition, would not have obeyed. Who is this foreigner, he would have properly demanded, in his indignation, that he should dictate to us? Neither he, nor one of his Synodals, protested against an innovation, a usurpation. Some certainly yielded, in their bitterness of regret at being obliged to abandon their traditions, to human passion, and upbraided the Pontiff, not one contested Rome's primacy of jurisdiction.

Another event in the history of the early Church, which admirably illustrates our thesis, is the dispute between Pope St. Stephen (253-257) and St. Cyprian, as to the rebaptism of those baptized by heretics. St. Cyprian, as we shall see, when we come to treat of this subject, was supported in his opinion and practice, by the African and Asiatic prelates, and the controversy was extremely bitter. Yet, when the Pontiff decreed the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, provided that the proper form had been used, not one of these bishops told him to attend to his diocese of Rome, and to leave Africa and Asia in peace. They recognized Pope Stephen as the successor of St. Peter; they felt with their leader, when he wrote of that Apostle (1), "Upon him alone He built His Church, and ordered him to feed His sheep. And although, after his resurrection, He gave similar power to all the Apostles, and said, 'As the Father sent me, so I send you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you forgive, they are forgiven them,' etc.; nevertheless, that He might manifest unity, He established one Chair, and, by His authority, disposed that the origin of that unity should be derived from one. The other Apostles were certainly that which Peter was, united in an equal society of

(1) ST. CYPRIAN; *Unity of the Church*.

honor and power. But the beginning takes its course from unity. The Primacy is given to Peter, that the Church of Christ may be shown one, and the Chair one. They are all shepherds ; but the flock is shown to be one, which is fed, with unanimous consent, by all the Apostles. . . Does he believe that he holds the faith, who does not hold to this unity of the Church? Does he believe that he is in the Church, who withstands and resists the Church, who deserts the Chair of Peter, upon which the Church is founded?" These fathers of Africa and Asia, who so sympathized with the theory of St. Cyprian, like those who had fought so strenuously for the perpetuation of their Paschal tradition, never for a moment dreamed of contesting the authority of the Roman Pontiff, because they recognized him as the occupant of "that Chair so celebrated by the Fathers, who have rivalled each other in exalting 'the principality of the Apostolic Chair, the chief principality, the source of unity, and in the place of Peter, the eminent grandeur of the sacerdotal Chair; the mother-Church, holding in her hand the guidance of all others; the source of the episcopacy, from which proceeds the ray of government; the principal Chair, the unique Chair, in which alone all preserve their unity.' You hear, in these words St. Optatus, St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, St. Irenaeus, St. Prosper, St. Avitus, Theodoret, the Council of Chalcedon and others, Africa, Gaul, Greece, Asia, the East and the West united together." (1)

(1) BOSSUET; *Sermon on the Unity of the Church*

## CHAPTER II.

### HERESIES OF THE FIRST THREE CENTURIES.

---

The Church had much to suffer, as we have seen, from the Pagan governments of the earth, and from the ignorant hatred of the Pagan peoples, during the first three centuries of her existence. This suffering was terminated, so far as the Roman Empire was concerned, by the conversion of Constantine. There was also another source of trouble which did not terminate with the active influence of Roman Paganism, and which, since God has irrevocably given to man a free will, will not terminate until the end of time. The Pagan persecutors of the early time killed the bodies of our ancestors in the faith, but the persecutors, of whom we are now about to speak, were killers, says Tertullian, of the truth itself. Heresy is one of those scandals which must of necessity cross the path of the children of light. So true is this, that the very first generation of Christians found themselves face to face with this far greater agony than any caused them by the Pagan torturer of the body.

SIMON, called *Magus*, from his profession of the art of magic, is the first heretic of whom history makes mention. He was a Goth by blood, but was probably born at Samaria. The people of this town had already begun to venerate him, when he professed the Christian faith, and received baptism at the hands of Philip the Deacon. Having tried to purchase the gifts of the Holy Ghost, as we are told in *Acts*, 8, he became the cause of the Church's introduction of a new term into her vocabulary—the word “Simony,” which, unfortunately, is often met with in her history. The doctrines of Simon so teem with absurdities, that we would be tempted to deny that any person could have accepted them, were

it not for the authority of Irenaeus, (1); Epiphanius, (2); Cyril of Jerusalem, (3); and Theodoret, (4). Thus, he was always accompanied by a Tyrian woman named Helen, who had been a common prostitute, and his followers must have been especially interested in her when they were informed that she was the same Helen who had caused the siege of Troy. They seem, however, to have been prepared to swallow anything offered by Simon, for they believed him when he declared that it was he who had some years before appeared to the Jews in the guise of the Son of God; that he had descended at Samaria as the Father; and that the other peoples knew him as the Holy Ghost. He also declared that his Helen was the first conception of his divine mind, and the mother of all men; that the love of the fallen angels for her kept her upon earth, and that to seek her—the wandering sheep—he had come upon earth. He erected his own image to be adored under the name of Jupiter; that of Helen under the name of Minerva. According to Simon, the Mosaic Law came not from God, but from some evil Intelligence, and all who adhered to it would eternally perish. These who trusted in him and his Helen might do what they pleased and yet be saved. Men were to be saved, not by good works, but by his grace. He not only allowed all sorts of obscenity, but taught certain mysteries of impurity, which he designated as the mysteries of perfect knowledge, without which no man could be saved.

With regard to the origin of the world and of man, he taught that it was through his Helen that he first conceived the idea of creating the angels, and that they afterwards created the world and mankind. The idea of the necessity of good works was suggested to man by the angels, that they might keep him in slavery to themselves. Although Simon pretended to despise the angels, yet he taught his disciples to mollify them by certain mysterious rites, lest they should seize and detain the soul when it left the body.

Simon must have been a master in the magic art, or he would not have succeeded so well in deceiving men. Nero

(1) *Against Heresies* b, 5, c. 20.

(2) *Heresies*, 21.

(3) *Catechism* No. 6.

(4) *Fables of the Heretics*, c. 1.

and some of the first people of Rome succumbed to his illusions, and he was only convicted of imposture, when, having attempted to show his divinity by flying in the air, the prayers of St. Peter caused him to perish miserably (1). Simon Magus was recognized by St. Irenaeus as the head and front of Gnosticism. But the term Gnostic is applied by the olden authors to many different sects. As all heresiarchs necessarily vaunt themselves as possessing more or less of knowledge superior to that of their fellow Christians, and this arrogance is shared by their followers, so the term Gnostic, "knowing one," came to be given to, and readily accepted by, most of the early heresies. The word fastened itself, however, in a peculiar manner, to the disciples of Carpocrates, of whom we shall speak in their proper place. Properly speaking, Simon Magus, as well as his disciple Menander, should be placed among the false Messiahs of the world, rather than among the heretics, for they both declared that they were sent by the invisible powers to operate the salvation of mankind; they both claimed to be the Holy One hitherto unknown to men.

MENANDER was a Samaritan, and a disciple of Simon. He commenced to propagate his errors in the year 74. He taught that he was the saviour of men, come down from heaven. No man could be saved from the tyranny of the angelic creators of the world unless he was initiated in the mysteries of magic and had received his baptism. This baptism would secure the recipient not only from death, but from the miseries of old age.

SATURNINE was an Antiochian, and though his heresy did not flourish until about the year 120, yet it should be treated of in this place, as the author was a disciple of Menander. Accepting Simon's doctrine as to the angelic creators of man, he taught that when the angels had succeeded in producing the body of the first man, they were unable to give it life, but that God sent the vital spark from heaven, which spark, after death, returns to its source. The God of the Jews was one of the angels, and the Saviour was sent

(1) ARNOBIUS, *Against the Gentiles*, b. 2; ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *cat.* 6; EUSEBIUS, *Hist.*, b. 2, c. 12; ST. EPIPHANIUS, *Heresies* 21; ST. AUGUSTINE, *Heresies*; THEODORET, *Fables*; ST. MAXIMUS OF TURIN, *serm.* 5.

on earth to keep this deity in order, and to save those who would believe in himself. Christ was incorporeal, and appeared to men only as a phantasm; all His actions, His suffering, death, &c., were purely phantastic, in no sense real. Nuptials and carnal generation were of Satanic origin. When the angels created men they established two orders, one of the good, and the other of the bad.

BASILIDES, a companion of Saturnine in the school of Menander, was an Alexandrian by birth. He wrote a gospel, and about forty books of commentaries on the Scriptures. He held that there was one Principle, the creator of Mind, in its turn the producer of the Word. From the Word, Prudence had origin; from Prudence came Virtue and Wisdom. These two created the Powers and the Angels, who in turn, created the highest heaven and other angels; these last produced another heaven, and still more angels, and so on continued the productive process until there were 365 heavens, each with its own order of spirits. The lowest order created the earth, and their prince created man. It was this angelic chief whom the Jews knew and worshipped, and who sent his Mind in the form of Christ to free man from the dominion of his angelic tyrants. When Christ was being led to death, He changed bodies with the Cyrenian; then Simon was crucified, and the Saviour stood by unknown.

The human body does not rise from the grave. Our souls have sinned in another life, and are punished here. Voluntary sins are not forgiven, but the only punishment of sin is in the nature of the transmigration to which all souls are subject. In time of persecution it is proper to deny God before the enemy, because only the just are men, the others being as hogs and dogs; we are obliged to confess God only before men. Like his predecessors, Basilides taught his followers the most revolting obscenities. Against his doctrines wrote St. Ignatius, Martyr; Castor Agrippa, and Sts. Clement of Alexandria and Epiphanius.

CERINTHUS is said to have moved the question as to the observances of the Jewish law, which caused the Council of

Jerusalem (1). His fundamental errors were the following — There is but one God, but He did not directly create the world; He produced certain distinct Powers, who altogether ignore Him. The Mosaic law is binding upon man, equally with the Gospel. When the man Jesus became an adult, the Christ descended upon Him, and after the crucifixion returned to Heaven. Cerinthus mutilated the gospel of St. Matthew, and rejected much of St. Paul's Epistles, and all of the Acts. He seems to have had a special affection for Judas. His followers used to receive baptism in the name of those who had died without it. After the final resurrection the earthly kingdom of Christ is to come, and for a thousand years men are to live in Jerusalem in the enjoyment of carnal pleasure.

EBION taught that God gave to Satan power over the present world, and to Christ the future. Christ was a mere man, born of Joseph and Mary. Some of his followers, we learn from Tertullian (2), held that Mary conceived of the Holy Ghost, but denied that Christ was the Eternal Word. Ebion inculcated an equal respect for the Mosaic and Christian laws. He admitted as a gospel, only that of St. Matthew; he expunged from the Pentateuch all that permitted the eating of once animated things. Jesus was no more than a successor of Moses, but He was the prophet of truth, while the other prophets were only of intelligence. Ebion excogitated a book of Acts of the Apostles, in which he represented St. Paul as having been of Pagan parents, as having become a Jew for love of the pontiff's daughter, and as revolting from Judaism because he could not receive her in marriage.

NICHOLAS was one of the seven deacons of whom we read in *Acts*, c. 7, v. 5, but we do not know for certain how his name came to be given to a heresy. Some of the ancient writers hold that he had married a very beautiful woman, but had not the strength to leave her. St. Clement of Alexandria (3) says that, being accused of an excessive attachment for this woman, he offered to cede her to whoever would marry her. St. Clement adds that Nicholas

(1) EPIPHANIUS, *Heresies*, 28.

(2) *The Flesh of Christ*, c. 18.

(3) Stromaton, b. 3, c. 4

was very chaste, but that wicked men had misinterpreted his maxim that "we shall exercise the flesh," by which he meant to signify that we should rule it. Many authors hold that a Gnostic sect took their name from Nicholas without warrant, simply to feign a respectable parentage. Their principal errors were those of the Cerinthians. They especially venerated a fictitious female called Prunicus, a personification of voluptuousness. This heresy is mentioned by name in the *Apocalypse*, c. 2.

SAMPSEANS, or Schamseans, is the name given to a sect which arose in the second century, and is supposed to be identical with the Helcesites, founded by a false prophet called Elxai. According to St. Epiphanius, their doctrines were a mixture of Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity. Their name is derived from the Hebrew *schemesch*, the sun, they being supposed to have worshipped that planet; that they did so, is doubted by some (1). They held that Christ was a creature; that the Holy Ghost was of the feminine sex, and sister to Christ. They despised virginity, and commanded marriage. They rejected the Epistles of St. Paul. In the time of St. Epiphanius, this sect greatly vaunted the sanctity of two of their women, named Martha and Marthanna; they collected the dust from their sandals, and their spittle, that they might form amulets from them (2).

CARPOCRATES, an Alexandrian by birth, held that corporeal creatures were the work of the angels. Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, and many of these sectaries were equal to Him in virtue and wisdom. Nothing is evil in itself; the distinction of good and evil subsists only in the minds of men. Every species of voluptuousness is permissible. Souls transmigrate from body to body, according to *Matth.* 5, v. 25 *and* 26. These heretics placed the picture of Christ along with those of Pythagoras, Plato, &c., and venerated all alike with Pagan rites. In the time of Pope Anicetus, a female Carpocratian named Marcellina made a great many perverts in Rome itself.

The GNOSTICS, of the origin of whose name we have already spoken, held all the errors, with some changes, which we

(1) BEAUSOBRE, *History of the Manicheans*, v. 2, b. 9. (2) EPIPHANIUS, *Heresies*, 50.

have mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. Each of the 365 heavens of Pasilides had its presiding deity, so that, with Virtue and Prudence, the offspring of the Word, son of Mind, and finally, Mind itself, there were, subject to the One Great Principle, 369 minor gods. Christ was not born of Mary, unless in appearance. As to the turpitudes of the Gnostics, we decline to go into particulars, for, as Tertullian says, they were monstrosities rather than crimes. It is better, if we may use the words of St. Epiphanius, to consign the putrid corpse to the grave. This saint had learned the mysteries of the Gnostics from certain of their women, who, while he was a mere boy, had laid snares to his virtue, and were necessity to arise for the divulgence of their nefarious practices, the student would find them accurately, though hesitatingly, narrated in his book *On Heresy*, num. 26. One of the greatest evils accruing to the Church from Gnosticism was the evil repute into which its immoralities brought the Christian name among the Pagans. St. Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and other apologists, spent a great part of their time in clearing Christianity from the imputation of responsibility for Gnostic wickedness.

CERDO was a Syrian who came to Rome during the Pontificate of Hyginus. According to St. Irenaeus, he again and again apostatized, and again and again did public penance and was absolved. His principal error was that the God of the Prophets was not the Father of our Lord. The God of the Jews was just and severe, while the Father of Jesus was good and benign. Christ was not born of Mary, and was man only in appearance. Of the New Testament, he rejected some of the Epistles of St. Paul, the Acts, the Apocalypse, and all the Gospels excepting a portion of St. Luke's. Cerdo was condemned by St. Apollonius of Corinth in a Synod of oriental bishops.

MARCION came from the neighborhood of the Black Sea. After a terrible picture of that region, worse in his day than in our own, Tertullian (1) says, "But the most barbarous and sorrowful thing about Pontus is that there was born Marcion, more loathsome than a Scythian, more unstable

(1) *Against Marcion*, b. 1, c. 1.

than a Hamaxobian, more cruel than a Massagetan, more brazen than an Amazon, . . . more deceitful than the Danube, more refractory than Caucasus. Why not, when the true Prometheus, God Almighty, is wounded by his blasphemies? For Marcion is more unsparing than were the beasts of that barbarity. What beaver is such a castrator of the flesh as he who abolishes nuptials? What ermine is such a devourer as he who eats into the gospels? Thou, O Euxine, hast produced a beast no more acceptable to philosophers than to Christians. That little dog, Diogenes, carrying a lantern in mid-day, tried to find a man; Marcion, having put out the light of faith, lost the God he had found." This heresiarch was the son of a pious bishop, and his father was compelled to excommunicate him for the crime of rape. Going to Rome after the death of Pope Hyginus, he in vain applied to the Roman clergy for restoration to communion, and then joined the disciples of Cerdo. He first attracted notice about the year 144, in the Pontificate of Pius I. He tried to solve the question of the origin of evil by admitting a good and evil Principle. According to him, Christ did not assume true flesh. Marcion denied the resurrection of the body, and taught metempsychosis. Cain, Dathan, Esau, the Sodomites, and all the nations who did not know the God of the Jews, were saved by Jesus; Abel, Enoch, and the Patriarchs, were not then saved, because they acknowledged said God, when they ought rather to have turned to the other God, who cannot be seen with eyes, but they will yet be saved by another Christ. Marcion rejected the Old Testament, because produced by the evil God; as for the New, he admitted only the gospel of St. Luke, and portions of some of St. Paul's writings. He taught that man could attain salvation, only by abstaining from all pleasure not purely spiritual. Hence, he condemned marriage, and made of continence a rigid obligation, though he had himself grossly failed in its regard (1). Baptism could be given only to the continent, but, to more and more purify

(1) The reason of Marcion's strictness in matter of continence is found in his theory that the human race owes its origin to the evil principle. It became a duty therefore to abstain from the propagation of the human family. This contempt for the carnal part of man caused the Marcionites to rush blindly into martyrdom, but history mentions only three who suffered with the Catholics.

one's self, it could be received three times. According to Tertullian, in his *Prescriptions*, c. 30, Marcion finally repented of his apostacy, and implored to be allowed to enter upon a course of public penance; his request was granted, on condition that he would restore to the Church those whom he had allured from her, but he was soon overtaken by death.

VALENTINE, chief of the heresy known by his name, was born in Egypt, shortly after the death of the last of the Apostles. Being ambitious of the episcopacy, and having been disappointed, he turned his attention to heresy as another avenue of fame. Rome was a wider theatre than Alexandria, but he tried in vain to obtain followers there; expelled from that church, he settled in Cyprus, where he had better success, and soon his disciples began to spread his ideas in a part of Europe, and in Asia and Africa. He admitted a Divinity sojourning from eternity in a *pleroma*, plenitude, of light; there were also there thirty Æons, immortal intelligences, male and female, born of the union of Bythos, (depth), the first father, with Ennœa or Sige (silence), and from their offspring. The first progeny of Bythos and Ennœa were Intellect and Truth; these also produced two Æons, &c. The last of the thirty were Christ and the Holy Ghost (1). According to Valentine, there are three species of men; the earthly, animal, and spiritual. Cain was the source from which springs the earthly man, and that race is dissolved in corruption. Abel was the father of the animal men, and if they conduct themselves well, they will rest in a middle region; if not, they will pass into a similar animal state. Seth gave origin to the spiritual man, and he will be married to an angel of the Saviour. Catholics, said Valentine, are animal persons, and for their attainment of salvation, good works are necessary; the Valentinians, on the contrary, are spiritual, and for their salvation knowledge is sufficient. Hence, those among these secta-

(1) Heretics always find apologists, no matter how absurd may be their teachings. If the absurdities are too patent for excuse, then it is claimed that the doctrine must not be taken too literally. So it has been with these theories of Valentine, which, by the way, were taught by many before him, though in a different form. It has been contended that Valentine only used a mystic method of explaining the operations of God; that his notions are, in the main, those of Pythagoras and Plato, who probably derived them from the Chaldeans. For an excellent, though brief, treatise on this subject, see Bergier's *Dictionary of Theology*, art. *Valentinians*.

ries who thought themselves perfect, ignored even the divine law, perpetrating any foul deeds to which they were tempted. Valentine explained the mortal birth of the Saviour by saying that Christ took His body from Heaven, not from the womb of Mary; that He passed through Mary, Valentine admitted; as Tertullian expresses the idea, "He issued through the Virgin, not from the Virgin."

TATIAN was a celebrated Syrian philosopher, and after embracing Christianity he became a disciple of St. Justin. After the martyrdom of his master he returned to his own land, and fell into error. Like Marcion, he taught the two Principles, good and evil. The latter, he said, was the author of the Old, the former of the New Testament. He condemned the use of marriage, meat, and wine, as all equally the work of the evil Principle. According to him, Christ had only the appearance of a human body. Tatian composed a gospel called *Diatessaron*, that is, a union of the original four; in it he excluded all the texts which showed that the human genealogy of Christ was from David. The followers of Tatian were called Encratites, or Continentals. One of these, a certain Severus, not to be confounded with the Eutychian patriarch, Severus, of the sixth century, held that, after the creation of man by God, Satan felt the need of some help on earth, and hence created woman.

MONTANUS was a Phrygian eunuch, and commenced to teach his heresy during the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-161). He was greatly aided by two abandoned women named Priscilla and Maximilla, who went about in the most free and easy manner, giving utterance to prophecies which time proved empty. Montanus and his women were especially noted for greed of money, which, says Apollonius, who wrote against them, of itself proved the falsity of their prophetic claims, since the Scriptures forbid the prophets to receive money. The errors of Montanus may be summed up as follows. In His revelations to man, God has proportioned his lessons to the capacity of man at the time. Thus, those given to the Jews were fuller than those given to the patriarchs, while those given by Christ were still more extensive and satisfactory. Montanus was the Paraclete promised by

Jesus as the teacher of all things. A hundred years after Montanus, Manes, and in the seventh century, Mohammed, preached a similar doctrine; all three forgetting that the Paraclete had been promised *to the Apostles*, and that it was therefore absurd to expect another, for whom there was no necessity. The first Montanists made no alterations in the Creed, but they claimed a system of morality more perfect than that of the Apostles. That it was certainly more austere, is seen from the fact that they denied to the priesthood the power of absolving from the greater crimes; that they kept three Lents, during which they ate nothing containing juice; that they regarded second nuptials as adulteries; that they said that we cannot fly from persecution, or purchase the leniency of the tyrant. Anything approaching taste and care in the toilet of females they regarded as diabolic; the arts and sciences, the study of philosophy and literature, were unworthy of Christians (1). Condemned by the synod of Hierapolis, they made their headquarters at Pepuzium in Phrygia, whence their other names of Pepuzians, Phrygians, and Cataphrygians. They established a hierarchy, into which they admitted women, saying that in Christ there is neither masculine nor feminine, *Gal. 3*. Their doctrines soon spread over Phrygia, Galatia, and Lydia, made some impression at Constantinople, but failed in Rome. Penetrating into Africa, they seduced, by their severe morality, the harsh and austere Tertullian. While in this heresy, Tertullian composed most of his moral treatises, and his books on Fasting, Chastity, Monogamy, and Flight from Persecution. Whether Tertullian finally returned to the bosom of the Church, is doubtful. The remaining heresies of the second century are of slight importance; therefore, we shall pass to the principal ones of the third century. Some of these are of such importance, that we shall treat of each in a special chapter; they are Novatianism, the error of the Re-baptizers, and the heresy of Paul of Samosata.

(1) Sts. Augustine, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Epiphanius, attribute certain terrible rites to the Montanists, especially to the Pepuzian faction. Thus they are said to have had a rite in which an infant was punctured by needles in the entire body, and the blood, being mixed with flour, was used for the Eucharist. If the child died, he was a martyr; if he recovered, he would be a holy priest. Tertullian denies this; St. Jerome says he would rather not believe it.

SABELLIUS was born at Ptolemais, in Libya. He commenced to spread his errors about the year 260. According to him, the Father is the only Person in God, the Son and the Holy Ghost being attributes, emanations, or operations, not subsisting Persons. The Father may be likened unto the sun; the Son unto its light, and the Holy Ghost unto its heat. The Word emanated from the Father like a divine ray, and, united with Jesus, operated the redemption of man; then, the Word ascended to the Father, as the ray to its source. The divine warmth of the Father was communicated to the Apostles under the name of the Holy Ghost. Christ, therefore, was not God, nor the Son of God, in the true sense of the terms; if Sabellius admitted an Incarnation, it was of the Father, and hence the fathers who wrote against him placed him in the ranks of the Patripassians, founded by Praxeas, in the second century. This heresy made some progress in Asia Minor, and even at Rome. In the fourth century it was revived by Photin, and in more modern times by the Socinians.

MANES, whose name has been perpetuated in the Manichaean system, was not its founder; for, according to Plutarch, its doctrines were held among many nations of antiquity. Manes, born in Persia in the year 240, was bought as a slave, when quite young, by an aged widow, who, a short time before, had become the heir of a rich magician named Terbinthus, who had met the fate of Simon Magus. Terbinthus himself had been the disciple and heir of a certain Eastern prestidigitator and sorcerer, called Scythian, who also fell from the roof of a temple in Jerusalem while engaged in incantations. The wealthy widow gave a fine education to her favorite slave, and having manumitted him, adopted him as her heir. Among the treasures originally accumulated by the unlucky magician were four of his books, which, on the death of the old lady, fell, with the rest, into the hands of Manes. The contents of these books, mixed with adulterated Christian doctrine, formed the system which Manes now presented to the world. He was obliged to flee from Persia soon after receiving his inheritance, having escaped from the prison into which he had been

thrown on account of the death of the prince royal under his spells. Arriving at Mesopotamia, he announced himself as the Apostle of Jesus Christ (1), and commenced to preach his doctrines. In the year 277, he held a dispute with Archelaus, Bishop of Cascar, who proved, to the satisfaction of all, that Manes was an impostor. The *Acts* of this conference are yet extant (2), and are the source of whatever information Socrates gives as to this heresiarch. Manes now returned to Persia, but falling into the hands of the king, he expiated the death of the prince royal by being flayed alive. His disciples carried his doctrines throughout the East, and finally they entered Europe. At the end of the fourth century they were well known in Africa and in Spain. Down to the time of the Emperor Anastasius they were under the ban of the empire, but, in the year 491, under the influence of his Manichæan mother, that sovereign gave them some rest. Justin and his successors returned to the old rigor. Manicheism, though divided into numerous sects, was quite powerful in the East until the end of the ninth century, when, having joined the Saracen invaders, its professors were defeated in several campaigns, and finally dispersed. Some penetrated into Bulgaria, others into Lombardy, and in the beginning of the eleventh century we find them strong in France, especially in Provence and Languedoc. In the diocese of Albi they were particularly numerous, whence their name of Albigenses. During the last years of their existence, the Manichæans had abandoned the fundamental hypothesis of two Principles; they spoke of the evil Principle as we do of Satan. But they clung to their errors as to the Incarnation and the Sacraments, to their hatred of the Catholic hierarchy, and to that refined libertinage which often accompanies false spirituality.

With regard to the errors of Manicheism, it must be observed that its leaders did not follow Manes in everything; each one arranged his doctrines so as to best suit the

(1) Some authors have held that Manes was a Christian priest; St. Cyril of Jerusalem asserts that he never embraced the faith.

(2) *Collection of Ancient Monuments of the Greek and Latin Churches, Rome, 1696.*

time and circumstances. Theodoret counted seventy sects of Manicheans, who were united in the avowal of belief in two Principles, but who differed as to their nature and operations, as well as to the speculative and moral consequences to be drawn therefrom. But the following points were of general acceptance among them. Starting with the idea of a good and an evil Principle, they declared that flesh being material, and matter being the work of the evil Principle, the flesh of Christ was not real, but simulated (1). They condemned generation, and impeded it; the priests instructing the married, according to the ideas of the time, how to effect the nefarious design (2). Our bodies, they said, will not arise from the grave, for the simple reason that they come from the evil one (3). They rejected the Old Testament, asserting that the God of Moses was one of the princes of darkness; as for the New, some admitted this portion, some not (4). Each man has two souls, one of which is a part of God, and the other from the evil one; every good deed is to be attributed to the good soul, every evil one to the bad (5). In man there is no free will; if there were, God would be to blame for sin (6). Baptism is not necessary for salvation, and hence they baptized none of their number (7). Souls transmigrate; the souls of Manicheans are assumed by the more perfect of the sect in their food, and being thus purified, return to the good Principle (8). Some of the customs, of the Manicheans were strange, and some detestable. Some again were simply horrible, and like those of the Gnostics, are better left unnoticed (9).

Before closing this chapter upon the heretics of the first three centuries, we would say something upon the doctrines of Origen, if it were certain that this great writer was guilty of heresy. This great man, says Tillemont, "was banished from his country, deposed from the priesthood, excommunicated by his own bishop and by others, at the same time that great saints were defending his cause, and when God seemed to have declared for him, by bringing into the Church,

1) AUGUSTINE, *Heresies*, 46; EPIPHANIUS, *Heresies*, 66.

(2) *Idem*, *Customs of the Manicheans*, c. 18.

(3) *Idem*, *Against Faust*, c. 2.

(4) *Idem*, *ibidem*, c. 3.

(5) *Idem*, *On the Two Souls*, c. 1.

(6) *Idem*, *On Free Will*, *passim*.

(7) AUGUSTINE, *Heresies*, *passim*.

(8) *Ibidem*.

(9) AUGUSTINE, *Customs of the Manicheans*, c. 18, 19, 20.

through him, many men whom she regards as her brightest ornaments. After his death, his lot is what it was while he lived. Saints are opposed to each other in his regard. Martyrs have written his apology, and martyrs have written his condemnation. Some have looked upon him as the greatest master the Church has possessed since the Apostles; others have detested him as the parent of all the heresies born since his time." It is not within the scope of our work to enter upon a question which the reader can better settle, at least to his own satisfaction, by comparing the arguments of the many learned men who have discussed the matter. That Origen was not an obstinate heretic, to say the least, would appear from the following passage cited by St. Jerome, and taken from a letter written after his excommunication at Alexandria. Complaining that his writings have been mutilated and corrupted, and that many have been ascribed to him which he never wrote, he says, "I am content to leave my enemies and my calumniators to the judgments of God; I think that I am obliged to pity them more than to hate them, and I would rather pray God to have mercy on them than wish them any evil, for we are born to pronounce blessings and not malediction." (1)

(1) "The olden enemies of this father," says Bergier, "carried their obstinacy to the point of accusing him of approving of illicit magic, and of finding no crime in it. Beausobre, in his *History of Manichæism*, v. 2, b. 9, c. 13, refutes this accusation . . . . . Some authors have asserted that Origen succumbed during the persecution of Decius, and that he threw incense into a sacrificial fire, in order to escape an infamous treatment with which he was threatened. But it is not credible that so courageous a man as Origen would have thus contradicted the lessons given by himself to so many martyrs; and that the many enemies who attacked him, after his death, would not have mentioned so odious a charge. So true is it that a great reputation is frequently a very great misfortune." Daniel Huet, bishop of Avranches, was the first to publish the exegetic works of Origen (1668-1679), in 2 v., fol., with a learned monograph entitled *Origeniana*. The learned Benedictine of St. Maur, La Rue, published, in 1733, the complete works; and the reader will find all that we have from the pen of Origen, together with a Latin translation, in Migne's *Patrology*.

## CHAPTER III.

### FIRST PERSECUTIONS OF THE CHURCH.

---

Authors differ as to the number of the persecutions which the Church underwent before the time of Constantine. St. Augustine, in his beautiful work on the *City of God*, book 18, c. 52, gives us many opinions, and declares his own inability to solve the question. Paulus Orosius thought there were ten, but only because he regarded the ten plagues of Egypt as prophetic of the Pagan onslaughts on the early faithful. Sulpicius Severus numbered nine; Lactantius five, but he only enumerates those the instigators of which met a violent death; Prudentius devotes all his energy to a description of the sufferings of the Christians under Nero and Decius. But, be the number ten or less, it is certain that there were many severe persecutions, and that the number of martyrs was large. Reflections upon the fearful sufferings of their ancestors in the faith have ever been the source of triumph, rather than of melancholy, to the more modern Christians, and their polemicists have drawn from these persecutions one of their most stringent arguments wherewith to prove the divinity of the Christian religion. It is not strange, therefore, that writers of the Grobon stamp should endeavor to belittle the extent of these dire visitations of brute force, and to palliate in every way the cruelties by which they were accompanied. Among the many men of note who have bent themselves to this melancholy and ungracious task, sad pre-eminence is claimed by Voltaire; but in the contest of bad faith and sophistry, distinction should also be awarded to Basnage, John Leclerc, Gibbon, and Henry Dodwell. The last named, an Irish author of the seventeenth century, has presented

his arguments more fully than any of his brethren, and hence against him have principally been directed the efforts of most Catholic writers who have treated of this subject. Of these, the most satisfactory are Rinaldi, on the *Persecutions of the First and Second Centuries*; Ruinart, in his *Preface to the Acts of the Martyrs*; F. Luchini, in a preface to his Italian translation of the work of Ruinart; and Palma, in his *Historical Lectures*.

Although it is our main purpose to treat of those persecutions which were visited upon the early Christians by the Pagans, yet we cannot omit, at the commencement, a mention of the uprising against the disciples of the Lord, excited by the Scribes and Pharisees in the year following His death (1). It was then that suffered St. Stephen, the first martyr, and, according to some writers, two thousand others. Nor should we forget the outburst of Herod Agrippa at Jerusalem, in the eleventh year after the crucifixion of Christ, when St. Peter was put in chains, and, in all probability (2), St. James the Greater put to death. Some also regard as a persecution of Christians that edict of Claudius by which all "Jews" were expelled from Rome, because, as Suetonius says, "at the instigation of *Chrest*, they were guilty of tumults." Many authors exclude this action of Claudius from the list of persecutions, on account of the use of the term "Jews," and because of the name *Chrest* being assigned to the Jewish leader. But we know that in those days the Pagan writers often spoke of the Christians as Jews. As for the name *Chrest*, it was in familiar use among the Romans, as appears from many inscriptions, and from Cicero, book 2d of Epistles, Epist. 8, *ad Fam.* Very easily indeed might the Pagans have confounded the name of Christ with that of *Chrest*, with which they were more familiar. Palma is of opinion that this ejection of the "Jews" should not be classed among the Christian persecutions, because the alleged cause of the edict was the tumultuousness of the victims, not their religion. But very

(1) Petau, Usher, and Tillemont assign this persecution to the year of our Lord's death: Baronio places it in the year 35.

(2) It has always been a Spanish tradition that St. James preached in Spain, but there is no solid foundation for it.

frequently the Pagan authorities, in assigning a reason for their assaults upon the Christians, made no mention of religion; nay they not seldom put forth purely political motives as an excuse. And if, as seems probable, by the *Chrest* of Suetonius was meant the Lord of the Christians, the religious motive is plainly indicated.

To the emperor Nero (37-68) is to be assigned the first open persecution of Christianity by Rome. The precise year of his first outburst is a subject of dispute among critics. Baronio regards the year 66 as the date, Eusebius the year 70, and others go back as far as the year 58. The probable date is that assigned by Pagi, namely, the month of August of the year 64, in the consulate of Licinius Bassus and Marcus Lic. Crassus. As for the cause of the persecution, authors differ. Hegesippus and Nicephorus Calixtus ascribe it to the destruction of the impious Simon Magus, brought about by the prayers of St. Peter. Others find the cause in the rage of Nero, on account of St. Paul's having restored to life one Patroclus, whom the emperor had put to death. Another reason is traced by some to the corrupt habits of the heretics of that day, which had brought the Christian name into terrible disrepute (1). Some again assign the reason of the outbreak to the ancient law of the Roman Senate prohibiting the adoration of any deity not approved of by that body. While each and every one of these causes may have either influenced the emperor, or persuaded the people to acquiesce in the decree, the real motive of the persecution seems to be given by the Pagan historian, Tacitus (2). In the year 64, the city of Rome was visited by a terrible conflagration, which, according to this author (3), lasted for six days. It was bruited around that no less a personage than the young emperor was the incendiary, and so firm a hold did the idea take on the minds of the people, that Nero was forced to seek some means of diverting the imminent fury of the Romans from himself. The necessary scapegoat was found in the rapidly growing sect of the Christians. This body of religionists were in

(1) *Justin Martyr and Eusebius*. (2) *Annals*, book 15, c. 44. (3) According to an ancient monumental slab, preserved in St. Peter's at Rome, the fire lasted nine days.

bad odor among the Romans. They were popularly supposed to be guilty of secret and atrocious crimes; to be animated by a most ferocious hatred towards the rest of mankind. Against them, therefore, was the indignation of the mob directed. In a few days Rome was illuminated by an unwonted light. Torches were made of the quivering bodies of thousands of innocents of both sexes and of every age, while daily use was made of every torture which imagination could invent for the amusement of a cruel people. Dodwell (1) asserts that this persecution was confined to the city of Rome, but there is abundant proof that it extended throughout the empire. Tacitus assigns as a reason for it that the Christians were accused "not so much of the crime of incendiarism, as of a hatred of the human race," which charge would certainly apply equally well to all of them. Again, we learn from an epistle of the younger Pliny to Trajan (2) that while he was pro-praetor of Bithynia, many Christians having been sentenced to death, he asked the emperor Trajan what course he should pursue in their regard, and that he was answered that only those Christians should be prosecuted whom some one should accuse by name. Now, the laws in accordance with which Pliny and Trajan thus acted were not laws made by Trajan, for Tertullian and other ancient writers, while they admit that many Christians suffered death during his reign, deny that he was a persecutor. Nor could they have been the laws promulgated by Domitian, for, according to Tertullian, they were repealed by that emperor himself; according to Eusebius, they were abrogated by the Senate or by Nerva. And they could not have been laws of the old republic; for while we know from Cicero (3) that no new gods were to be received without the approbation of the Senate, yet capital punishment was not the penalty for a violation of the decree. It follows then that the laws under which Pliny condemned the Bithynian Christians were laws of Nero, which had not been cancelled by his successors. Therefore the persecution decreed by that emperor was not restricted to the capital.

(1) *Cyprianic Dissertations*, no. XI. (2) *Book 10, epist. 97*. (3) *On Laws*, book 2, c.

Next in order to that of Nero comes the persecution of Domitian, who mounted the throne in the year 81. Baronio assigns its commencement to the year 90; Pagi prefers the year 93; Rinaldi agrees with St. Jerome in placing it in the year 94. Some writers have interpreted the first epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians as indicating that the cause of the eruption is to be found in the dissensions which existed in the Christian ranks. But it is more likely that its origin must be ascribed to the virulent hatred of the populace towards the new religion. It was during the first year of this persecution, according to Tertullian, that the Apostle St. John was plunged into a caldron of boiling oil, and, emerging intact, was exiled to Patmos. After St. John, the most distinguished victim of this persecution was Flavius Clement (1), who was of consular rank, and, although a cousin of the emperor, was executed for impiety towards the gods. The universality and cruelty of this persecution is impugned by Dodwell and his imitators, but the testimony of ancient and reliable authors proves that it was general and terrific. Dio Cassius says, "In the same year Domitian put to death, among many others, Flavius Clement, although he was his own cousin, and had for wife Flavia Domitilla, a relative of his; both were charged with impiety towards the gods, and many others. . . . were condemned for this crime, some being executed, and some despoiled of their goods. Domitilla was merely exiled to Padetaria, but he ordered Glabrio, who had been a magistrate under Trajan, to be killed." Brutius, a Pagan author of the second century, is authority to Eusebius for asserting that under Domitian many Christians were put to death. It is true that we have but comparatively few authentic records of martyrdoms in this and previous reigns, but that want does not necessarily bring comfort to those who would palliate the cruelty of the persecutors. At this time there was a dearth of writers among the Christians, not because they were at all lacking in men or culture, but because, as Papebroch observes,

(1) Baronio seems to doubt as to his martyrdom, on account of the silence of the ancient Martyrologies. In the year 1725, the body of this martyr was found in the ancient basilica of St. Clement at Rome. Traces of blood were found in the leaden case, as well as the glass bottle usually and only placed with the body of a martyr. On the case were inscribed the words, "Here is happily buried the martyr, Flavius Clement."

in the midst of consternation people are not likely to make formal records of events. The ecclesiastical notaries, one of whose duties it was to put on record the important events of their churches, were certainly not established before the time of Domitian, and probably afterwards. And we know that in the Calendars, *Festa*, Diptychs, and other monuments of the time, it was not the custom to insert any but the names of those martyrs who were venerated in the particular church owning the document. Sometimes only those were recorded whose "natal days" were celebrated in pomp and by public sacrifice. Had the persecution of Domitian been comparatively light, as Dodwell contends, the Christians would scarcely have styled him "another Nero;" Lactantius would not have called him "no less a tyrant;" Tertullian would not have applied to him the phrase, "heir to a portion of Nero's cruelty."

After the death of Domitian, in the year 96, the Christians experienced a little rest, although isolated cases of martyrdom were of not unfrequent occurrence (1). Nerva rescinded the cruel decrees of his predecessor, allowed the exiles to return, and ordered that hereafter no one should prosecute the "Jewish sect" for impiety. But with the reign of Trajan (y. 98) terror again visited the Christian communities. This persecution is styled the third by Sulpicius Severus, St. Augustine, and Orosius. As to the precise date of its beginning critics are again at fault. Baronio assigns it to the first year of the new reign; Pagi places it in the year 111; Usher, with more plausibility, names the year 106 (2). Tertullian and Eusebius show that Trajan issued no new decrees against the Christians, and he is generally regarded as one of those "good princes" under whom, as the ancient author of "Deaths of the Persecutors" says, "the Church suffered no assault from the enemy." But even if Trajan merely executed the old decrees of Nero, he no less merits the name of persecutor. During his reign happened the martyrdom of St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, in the year

(1) If we accept as true the narrative of Polycrates, which is defended by the Bollandists and by Tillemont, St. Timothy suffered at this time. However, some hold that he was killed during a popular tumult.

(2) *Notes to Martyrdom of St. Ignatius.*

107. In the very beginning of this reign, according to Pearson, was crucified the bishop of Jerusalem, Simeon, the son of Cleophas. Under Trajan also suffered the Supreme Pontiffs, St. Clement (*Romanus*), Evarist, and Alexander; the martyrs, Nereus, Achilleus, Sulpitius, Severianus, and Cesareus. That this persecution was widespread and virulent appears from the following words of the author of the Acts of St. Ignatius of Antioch, the authenticity and value of which work are readily admitted by such Protestant critics as Usher and Pearson. "In the ninth year of his reign, waxing arrogant on account of his victories over the Scythians and Dacians and many other peoples, and deeming only wanting to his universal domination the religious body of Christians, Trajan compelled all the pious livers to either sacrifice or die, threatening them with persecution unless they would join in the worship of the demons along with the rest of the people." The same fact is shown by St. Polycarp, who, in his epistle to the Philippians, besought them to imitate the patience of Ignatius, Zosimus, and Rufus (martyrs). And Tertullian, speaking to the proconsul Scapula, narrates the cruelties of Arrius Antoninus, Trajan's lieutenant in proconsular Asia. But no other authority need be adduced than that which we have already read in the younger Pliny, and for which Tertullian bitterly upbraids the emperor as cruelly inconsistent: "He orders them to be left undisturbed, as innocent; he commands them to be punished as guilty. He spares, and he is cruel; he dissimulates, and takes cognizance. Why dost thou subject thyself to censure? If thou condemnest, why dost thou not investigate? If thou dost not inquire, why not acquit?" Although he promulgated no new laws against the Christians, he left the persecution to the discretion of the prefects, and it is not likely that Pliny was the most cruel or corrupt of those satraps.

The persecution under Adrian was called by Eusebius an appendix of that of Trajan; Sulpicius Severus styles it the fourth of the list. According to Tertullian and Melito of Sardis, this emperor issued no edicts against the Christians; but as the present question is one of fact, and not

of name, we cannot admit with Dodwell that under his rule there were no persecutions. St. Jerome tells us Adrian was a devotee of Paganism ; Spartianus lauds him as most careful in fulfilling his duties as Pontiff ; Tertullian calls him an untiring seeker into curious things, and says that he followed all sorts of magical arts. With such dispositions, one would at least suspect him of being unlikely to leave the path of his predecessors. Baronio assigns as a reason for this fourth persecution the tumultuousness of the Jews. Some writers find its occasion in the abominable habits of the Carpocratian heretics, which caused the people to rage against all Christians. At any rate, the persecution took place, as we shall show. Tillemont adduces the *Acts* of St. Eustachius, who perished during the reign of Adrian, but more severe critics reject the documents. But there is no doubt of the authenticity of the *Acts of St. Symphorosa and her Seven Sons*, put to death by Adrian at his beautiful villa at Tivoli, after he had already destroyed her husband and his brother. From these *Acts* we learn that, about the same time, a very large number of martyrs were destroyed. Dodwell asserts that, with the exception of Pope St. Telesphorus, no martyr fell under Adrian. But we have an inscription from the catacombs of St. Callixtus published by Arringhi, in his *Subterranean Rome*, which proves the contrary. It reads as follows: "In the time of the emperor Adrian, at length rested in peace the youth Marius, an officer of the army, who lived long enough, since he yielded with his blood his life for Christ. His well wishers placed this with tears and fear." The word "fear" would certainly indicate some anticipation of future trouble to the survivors. The testimony of St. Justin Martyr may be adduced as proving the existence of persecution, probably under Adrian, and if not, certainly since the time of Domitian, for he was born in the year 105, and speaks of what he saw. "While I was yet a follower of the Platonic philosophy, and heard the Christians pursued by calumny, and saw them stand intrepid before death and all formidable things, I thought to myself that such persons could not be given to vice and voluptu-

ousness." Dodwell and his imitators tell us that Adrian gave rescripts of exemption in favor of Christians. This is true; but if persecution had not been going on, where would have been any occasion for the exemption? The facts are these. Adrian was passing the winter, probably of the year 126, at Jerusalem, and, initiating himself into the Eleusinian mysteries, his Pagan zeal was redoubled, and the Christians felt its effects. At this juncture, a petition was presented to him by Quadratus, a disciple of the Lord, (1) and Aristedes, an Athenian philosopher, begging for indulgence to the Christians. On account of these supplications, and because of a letter of Serenus Granius (or Granius), an Asiatic proconsul, urging that it was ill-seeming to condemn Christians merely on account of popular clamor, a decree was issued to Minucius Fundanus, successor to Granius, stopping the persecution. This rescript of Adrian was sent, according to Eusebius, not only to Fundanus, but to many other prefects, and was afterwards quoted by Melito of Sardis, in his *Apology* to Marcus Aurelius.

Antoninus Pius reigned from the year 138 to the year 161. He was singularly clement, and of very affable manners. Nevertheless, that his Christian subjects had no reason to revere his memory, we must judge from the following inscription (2) found in the Callixtan catacombs, and dedicated to the memory of a martyr named Alexander, who was killed under Antonine. "Oh! unhappy times, when, in the midst of sacred things, and occupied with our prayers, we cannot be safe even in the bowels of the earth; what more miserable than life, and what more miserable than death, when we cannot be buried by our friends?" And Justin Martyr, in his *Apology*, No. 1, expressly charges Antonine with a persecution of the Christians.

Marcus Aurelius succeeded his father-in-law Antoninus Pius in the year 161, and reigned until the year 180. He was quite a philosopher, having donned the mantle of the Stoics when but eleven years of age. A good warrior when

(1) Halloix thinks that this Quadratus is the "Angel of Philadelphia" to whom the Lord speaks in the Apocalypse.

(2) ARRIGHI, *Subterranean Rome*, book 3, c. 22.

necessary, he was yet a lover of peace, and his general course was more beneficial to his subjects than that of most Roman emperors. Some authors have scented the odor of a Christian spirit in his *Meditations*, but that he persecuted the Christians, is beyond the possibility of a doubt. After the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and disciple of St. John, the widowed church sent to all the other churches of Asia an epistle describing the sufferings of the holy bishop and of his twelve companions. He had been burnt at the stake in the year 169, and the fathers allude to many other martyrdoms which happened about the same time. Eusebius, in his Book 4, c. 26, gives many passages from an apology which Melito of Sardis presented to Aurelius, interceding for the Christians, and we find him insisting that no more cruel punishment could be visited upon them if they were enemies of the state. St. Irenaeus is supposed to be the author of an epistle which, during this reign, the churches of Lyons and Vienne sent to those of Asia and Phrygia, and in it we find a graphic description of the persecutions in Gaul. And if the sufferings of the Christians at this time were not great and widespread, why so much anxiety and eloquence as are displayed in the *Apologies* of Apollinaris, Athenagoras, and Miltiades, all written at this period?

From the death of Marcus Aurelius, in the year 180, until the year 197, the Church of God enjoyed a spell of tranquillity. Outbursts of popular hatred certainly occurred now and then, but no new law was enacted against the Christians, and the old laws fell into desuetude. But in the year 197, Septimius Severus was induced to shake the dust from the old edicts, and five years afterwards he promulgated a new one of the severest nature. The following passages of Eusebius would sufficiently indicate the quality of this persecution. In Book 6, c. 1, he says "when Severus had excited a persecution against the Church, throughout all the churches of the world were perfected illustrious martyrdoms on the part of athletes contesting for piety." And in c. 2, "Therefore in the tenth year of the reign of Severus, . . . . when there burst forth a most devastating

fire of persecution, and innumerable martyrs were crowned." Finally, in c. 7, "He thought that then was imminent the coming of Antichrist, so vehemently were the souls of many affected by this persecution against our people." The words of Dion Cassius are clear, "He visited with death a great number of men who were of equal nobility and honor with himself." Equally plain is the saying of Clement of Alexandria, in the 2d Book of his *Stromaton*, "For us are daily redundant the fountains of martyrdom; with our eyes we see those who are roasted, who are broken apart, who are beheaded." And in Book 4, he says that they are so treated merely "because they are Christians." These testimonies are enough to show that the persecution of Severus was bloody indeed; as to its length, there is no doubt that Dodwell errs when he states that it was a temporary storm. In his address to Scapula, who had been sent as proconsul into Africa towards the end of the persecution, Tertullian describes the course of procedure of no less than six successive proconsuls, which certainly proves that the attack was not a passing one.

The next open persecution was that of the emperor Maximin; but before we enter upon any account of it, we must say a few words in regard to the reign of Alexander Severus (222-235). This sovereign always manifested a kind of benevolence towards the Christians; his household was filled with them; his mother was "a good woman," and associated familiarly with the new religionists. Upon these slight foundations, some critics have built a theory that Alexander was a Christian. As for Julia Mamaea, the mother of the emperor, we have the testimony of St. Jerome and Eusebius that she was given to devotion, and they tell us that she once invited Origen to the palace, and that she listened to his doctrinal explanations. But they do not say that she was convinced of the truth of Christianity; on the contrary, Eusebius insinuates that the Egyptian doctor left immediately for home; so we may suppose that the fair Julia found his maxims too uncompromisingly severe for her delicate constitution. Nor does the testimony of Lampridius, in his *Life* of Alexander, go to show that Julia embraced

Christianity, for while he certainly styles her a holy woman, he speaks in a manner which plainly proves that he uses the term "holy" in anything but a Christian sense. He says she was "a holy woman, but miserly—fond of gold and silver." Such was not a characteristic of Christian sanctity, especially in the primitive ages. As to Alexander himself, we learn from Lampridius that he "conceded privileges to the Jews, and allowed the Christians to exist," which was very much from a Roman emperor, but was not equivalent to becoming a Christian. If this passage is conclusive for any theory of conversion, it proves that Alexander became a Jew rather than a Christian. And if the emperor really revered our religion, why was he content with simply permitting its votaries "to exist"? Why did he not abrogate the cruel laws against them which were exposing them to the uncertain disposition of each individual prefect? Nor must we forget that one of Alexander's most trusted administrators was Domitius Ulpianus, a man who used his power to the utmost to gratify his hatred towards the Christians, and who, we learn from Lactantius (1), "compiled a collection of the nefarious rescripts of the emperors in regard to the duties of a proconsul, that he might show what punishments ought to be inflicted upon the adorers of God." Had Alexander been a Christian, he would have removed from this and similar men the temptation and power to persecute. Of no value whatever is the argument drawn from the fact, narrated by Lampridius, that the emperor preserved in the oratory, where he made his matutinal devotions, an image of Christ. This image he cherished, but among those of Apollonius, Abraham, Orpheus, "and such like Gods." Nor were all the images in Alexander's oratory those of revered personages, for we know from the same Lampridius that he kept therein the image of Alexander the Great, whose drunkenness and cruelty he condemned. The other arguments adduced by those who have alleged the Christianity of Alexander Severus are of no moment whatever.

After the assassination of Alexander Severus in Gaul, in

(1) *Inst. Div.*, book 5, c. XI.

the year 235, the troops proclaimed as emperor the burly Maximin. The son of a Goth, his only staff in the struggle of life the possession of herculean strength, he was the right material for the forces of hell at a time when they relied upon brute force more than upon the depraved reason of man. His first move against Christianity appears to have been instigated by a spirit of intense personal hatred against the family of his easy-going predecessor. The household was filled with Christians, and its heads were favorably disposed towards the new religion; that was sufficient to unleash the hounds of prey. His first step was to pounce upon the ministers of religion: the shepherds removed, the flock would soon succumb. Before long the persecution spread throughout the length and breadth of the empire, and was felt the more terribly, says Firmilian of Cappadocia, because several years of comparative peace had unaccustomed the victims to such danger. For three years Maximin reigned, and wielded his bloody scourge, and during that time the Martyrology received many of its noblest additions.

The poet Prudentius (1) immediately connects the Decian with the Neronian persecution, saying nothing of the intervening ones we have noticed. But this by no means favors the theory of Dodwell as to the lightness of these afflictions. He was a poet, and in accordance with poetic license, chose what he deemed the fitter subject for his verse, even though he sinned against the canons of chronological criticism. The persecutors whom he omitted did not furnish the material to his taste, for Prudentius seems to gloat in a picture of bloody horror. The emperors intervening between Decius and Domitian preserved the forms of law in their trials, and did not adopt those terrific and exquisite tortures, to a description of which he owes his reputation. Hence he slighted them, and jumped at once to the more congenial task of drawing the horrors of Decius. As for Domitian, he very likely excused him from special reproach, because he had finally stopped the persecution. It is a remarkable fact that many ancient writers (Tertullian,

(1) *Against Symmachus*, book 11.

for instance) seem to have regarded as comparatively "good" those emperors who restricted their lieutenants in persecution to due process of law, and who tolerated only the prescribed punishments; while they almost confine their invectives to those who allowed full vent to individual hate, cupidity, and superstition. With this remark as to the silence of Prudentius, we take up the persecution of Decius, who mounted the imperial throne in the year 249, and reigned for two years. He affected, or perhaps really felt, great zeal for a reformation of Roman habits and for a restoration of the primitive "virtues" of the ancient republic. To bring about this end, he fancied a persecution of the new and foreign religion would tend. The text of his edict has perished, but we know from Dionysius of Alexandria (in Eusebius, b. 6, c. 41) that it was "horrible and terrific enough to frighten the elect." In his life of the holy Thaumaturge, St. Gregory of Nyssa is very explicit on this subject. We learn that "the emperor ordered the prefects and magistrates to force the Christians by terror and by every kind of torture, to the worship of the gods." He threatened his subordinates with severe punishment for any remissness in their task, and hence they neglected every duty of their positions to devote their time to the extirpation of Christianity. Forms of torture hitherto unknown were adopted, and the terrible engines were kept ever exposed to view, as an earnest of the power and will of the authorities. It was during this persecution that certain magistrates, moved by greed or by pity, devised the system of certificates of sacrifice (*libelli*), by means of which any unfortunate recusant could escape from both death and open denial of his faith. We shall have occasion to treat of these backsliders in an apposite dissertation. Suffice it now to remark that by this cunning device the persecution of Decius became noted as the first, if not the only one, in which any large number of the baptized failed to confess God before men.

The emperor Valerian ascended the throne in the year 255, and associated with himself as Cæsar his son Gallienus. For two years he showed himself kind to the Christians, but he finally allowed himself to be persuaded into per-

secution by his favorite, Macrianus the Praetorian. His first efforts were restricted to the exiling of the clergy and the prohibition of Christian assemblies, but he soon let loose the full force of persecution throughout the empire. In the *Acts of St. Cyprian*, we find the proconsul Paternus thus addressing the holy prelate : “ The most sacred emperors Valerianus and Gallienus have deigned to write to me, ordering that those who do not follow the Roman religion, should at least acknowledge the Roman ceremonies.” St. Cyprian refusing, he is condemned to exile, and Paternus continues, “ They have also commanded that assemblies be held in no places, and that no one enter the cemeteries ; if any one violates this salutary precept, he shall be beheaded.” Dionysius of Alexandria (in Eusebius, b. 7, c. XI.) narrates the experience of himself and companions. The prefect Æmilian said to them, “ You will be sent into the Libyan region, to the place called Cephro . . . . . ; you will not be allowed to hold meetings, or to enter the places you call cemeteries.” In St. Cyprian’s 77th epistle, to the confessors in the mines, we are informed how a great part of his flock had already flown to heaven ; how numbers of others lay in loathsome dungeons, lacerated by scourgings ; how many more were dragging out a painful existence in the mines, and all simply because they were Christians. “ And a large part of the people,” he tells the confessors, “ following your example, have also confessed the faith, and have been crowned ; they are united with you by the ties of a strong charity, nor are they separated from their prelates by prisons or by mines. Nor are virgins absent from this number. And even among the boys, there is a virtue greater than their age, which exceeds their years in the glory of their confession.” After a life of incredible labor and fortitude, St. Cyprian consummated his victory by a bloody death during this persecution, in the year 258. At this time also suffered Pope St. Sixtus II. and St. Lawrence the deacon. Finally, towards the end of the year 260, while warring with the Persian monarch Sapor, Valerian was taken prisoner. Gallienus paid no heed to his father’s plight, but at once seized the throne, and one of

his first acts was to order a cessation of the persecution.

In the next ebullition of Pagan hate against the growing Church, though it is generally styled the persecution of Diocletian, there figure two emperors and three Cæsars. After the assassination of Numerian in the year 284, the army, which was marching home from Persia, proclaimed Diocletian emperor. Two years afterwards, this prince chose as colleague his old companion in arms, Maximian Hercules; while in the year 292, he appointed as Cæsars Constantius Chlorus and Galerius Maximian. Deciding then to divide the empire, he made the following partition. He reserved to himself the provinces located beyond the Ægean; to Galerius Maximian, he assigned Thrace and Illyria; to Maximian Hercules, he gave Italy, Africa, and their islands; to Constantius Chlorus he presented Gaul, and this prince soon added Britain and Spain. Of very different characters were these princes whom Diocletian thus raised to power. Galerius, according to the author of the "Deaths of the Persecutors," was "more wicked than any evil man who ever lived," but he seems to have been possessed of military talent. Maximian Hercules was ferocious and depraved, but was a brave combatant, and nothing better. Constantius Chlorus was praised by both Christians and Pagans as an "amiable and venerable man;" although not a Christian, he adored one only God. The prime cause of Diocletian's persecution was Galerius; critics dispute as to the precise date of its beginning, but the best arguments assign it to the year 303. It did not end until long after the abdication of Diocletian, which happened in the year 305. After this event, the western Christians enjoyed some tranquillity, but Galerius continued the bloody work in the east until the year 311, when, feeling himself at the point of death, he issued an edict for its cessation. Peace was not everywhere restored until the year 313, in the third consulate of Constantine and Licinius.

As in the case of the previous persecutions, so in this one of Diocletian, the belittlers of Christianity endeavor

to show that it was of small account, and that very little damage was effected. To this, more than palliation of the imperial butchers, let the first answer be given by Eusebius. In book 1, c. 13, of his *Life of Constantine*, he says of Diocletian and his companion princes, "They polluted, as with civil war, their subject provinces with the slaughter of women as well as of men." Lactantius thought differently from Dodwell, Voltaire, and Gibbon, upon this matter, for he thus descants upon the imperial cruelty. "If it ever pleased victors to be so furious towards the conquered, they did no more than to kill them, or to lead them into slavery. But this is unspeakable, that they should so treat those who can do no harm . . . . Then, they torture them with the most exquisite kinds of punishments . . . .; they bend over them with all the powers of their slaughter-house, as though they thirst for blood, . . . and what Caucasus, what India, ever raised such bloody and ruthless beasts? . . . . That person is a beast, by whose single wish everywhere flows the purple gore; everywhere cruel tears, everywhere panic, and the multiplied image of death. No one can rightly describe the ferocity of this animal, which, though it crouches in one spot, nevertheless grinds its iron teeth through the universe, and not only consumes the entrails of men, but crunches their very bones, and even rages against their ashes, lest they should have a place of burial." Lactantius (260-325) was an eye-witness of what he describes, and he certainly does not mince matters as Gibbon would do. The ancient author of the *Deaths of the Persecutors* has the following, "Diocletian, who always wished to pass for intelligent and astute, inflamed with anger, immediately began to cut his familiars to pieces. He sat in judgment, and burned the innocents with fire . . .; the emperor became infuriated, not only against his familiars, but at every one, and, first of all, he compelled his daughter Valeria and his wife Prisca to sacrificial pollution . . . Persons of every age and sex were thrust into the flames, not merely one at a time, for so great was the multitude that they were collected into a heap, and fire built around them . . .; no less violently did the

persecutions fall upon other people." If such was the course of Diocletian, who preferred to avoid slaughter, we can imagine what must have been the conduct of the ferocious Maximian Hercules in his dominions. The last quoted author tells us that he "willingly obeyed" when Diocletian wrote to him to follow his example in his treatment of the Christians. That Galerius did not show himself far behind in anti-Christian zeal, goes without saying, for he was the prime mover of the persecution. Shortly after the partition of the empire, Galerius had induced Diocletian to give the rank of Cæsar to Maximin Daza, his nephew, who afterwards donned the purple. In regard to this prince's mode of procedure, Eusebius, in Book 8, c. 14, says that he gave the Christians "fire and sword, piercings with nails, wild beasts, deep pools, burnings, cutting off of limbs, perforations, boring of eyes, mutilations of the whole body; add to these, starvation, the mines, chains." As to Severus, another nephew of Galerius, and also appointed Cæsar, he afterwards obtained Italy and Africa, and there thoroughly carried out the ideas of his uncle. When Maxentius, the son of Maximian Hercules, gained a footing in these countries, he so conducted himself as to be styled, by Lucifer Calaritanus, "another Nero." But we have said enough to show that in this persecution of Diocletian, as in all the previous ones, there was sufficient misery to warrant a Christian in believing that only the hand of God could have sustained our ancestors in the faith in their fearful trial. (1)

(1) The apologists of Paganism declare that the Romans were justified in regarding the Christian Church as a dangerous association, since the new religionists were almost entirely separated from the rest of society, and were submissive only to their pastors, the only judges whom they acknowledged. This objection was answered by Tertullian, when he declared to the magistrates that the Christians were separated from the rest of society, only in the exercises of religion; in everything else, they conducted themselves as did other citizens. Our adversaries also accuse the Christians of having insulted the magistrates in their tribunals, and of thus provoking their cruelty. If there were such cases of misguided zeal, the Church did not approve of such conduct. In the Council of Elvira, held about the year 300, it was decreed that he should not be enrolled among the martyrs who ~~was~~ put to death, merely for breaking the idols.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE RAPID PROPAGATION OF CHRISTIANITY A PROOF OF ITS DIVINITY.

In the preceding chapter we have seen what terrible struggles the early Church was compelled to undergo. But these were not the only obstacles to her rapid development; humanly speaking, the severity of her doctrine, and the love of pleasure which was fostered by Paganism, should have contributed more to retard her advancement than was contributed by mere brute force. Christian writers have always adduced her quick and marvellous acquirement of the hearts of men as a proof of her divine origin, while men of the school of Gibbon and Voltaire have endeavored to show that there is nothing in her development which cannot be accounted for by purely human reasons. The object of this chapter is to show that the history of the early propagation of our religion is such as to demand, from a candid reader, an acknowledgment of a divine guidance, as the only possible reason for that propagation. We shall merely condense the arguments of the learned Valsecchi (1).

When Augustus wielded the sceptre of the Roman empire, the whole world, with the exception of Palestine, was gentile; when Nero mounted the throne, an immense multitude of Christians, according to Tacitus (2), was to be found, even within the walls of the capital. Under Domitian, the new faith penetrated into the Imperial palace, and claimed its converts among those raised in the purple. Flavius Clement, and his wife Domitilla, were among those put to death by this emperor on account of Christianity. While Trajan ruled, the younger Pliny (3) found the new religion

(1) *Sources of Religion and of Impiety*, b. 2, c. 14.

(2) *Annals*, b. 15, c. 44.

(3) *Book 10, epist. 97 to Trajan.*

"in the cities, in the villages, throughout the country places; professed by persons of both sexes, of every order and every age, even to the point of death; so that the temples are desolate, and the sacrifices for a long time stopped." St. Ignatius suffered under Trajan, and he wrote to the Philadelphians that the "Church founded in the Blood of Christ was spread from one end of the earth to the other." In the days of the Antonines, St. Justin, Martyr, asserted (1) that "there is not one nation of men, be it Greek or barbarian, or called by any name you will, whether it lives in the swamps and wants a roof, or lives in tents and feeds the flocks, from the midst of which do not ascend prayers and thanks to the Father and Creator of the universe, in the name of Jesus Crucified." St. Irenæus (d. 202) shows us the hierarchy of the Church in full working order throughout the empire. Speaking of Rome (2), he says that "To this Church, because of its preëminent principality, all churches must have recourse, that is, the faithful wherever they are, because in it is ever preserved the Apostolic tradition." Tertullian (d. 230) says, (3), "Only yesterday were we born, and we have filled all your places, the cities, the islands, the fortresses, municipalities, the councils, the camps, the palace, the senate, the forum; we leave you only the temples." In the book which the learned African wrote to the prefect Scapula, he draws a terrible picture of the wholesale desolation which would ensue if the Christians of Carthage were only decimated. And disputing with the Jews, he asks (4), "And in whom besides Christ, who has already come, have all the gentiles believed? . . . . . there are the Getuli, the Moors, the Spaniards, the Gauls, the Britons—not yet subdued by the Romans, but conquered by Christ—Sarmatians, the Dacians, the Germans, the Scythians, and many other races and countries and islands unknown to us, and which cannot be enumerated, in all of which places reigns the name of Christ." Tertullian was certainly a Christian, but not for that reason is his testimony as to the spread of his religion to be questioned. He

(1) *Dialogue with Trypho*, ii. 117.(2) *Book 3*, c. 3.(3) *Apology*, 37.(4) *Against the Jews*, c. 7.

would not have dared, especially in a polemical work, to risk an assertion which, if false, could easily be refuted. And we possess documents of certain authenticity, which go to prove that long before the cessation of persecution, the faith was propagated throughout the empire. The immense number of martyrs who yielded up their lives for Christ, and whose *Acts*, for the greater part authentic, have reached us, furnish an indisputable argument for our position. The Irish critic, Dodwell, in vain tries to reduce the number of martyrs to a trivialty; let the student consult Ruinart, in his *Preface to the Acts of the Martyrs*, and he will find that our writers have by no means exaggerated in their accounts. The following passage of Prudentius, who wrote in the fourth century, is pertinent to the question, (1). "We have seen in Rome the ashes of innumerable saints. Do you ask me to give the names and titles of each, as they are cut on their tombs? It would be difficult to grant your request, for the number of the just destroyed by impious fury was as great as the number of gods worshipped by Trojan Rome. Many sepulchres speak in minute accents of the name, some others bear an epigram upon the martyr. But there are many silent marbles, containing taciturn cohorts of victims, which record only the number within; how many bodies there are, you are told, but the names you do not find. From under one only slab, I remember were taken the remains of sixty heroes, whose names are known to Christ alone, as of those now united to Him in friendship." If such was the state of affairs in the capital, what must it have been throughout the empire?

And what result was obtained by the three hundred years of persecution? Simply the verification of Tertullian's saying (2) that the "blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church." When the advent of Constantine gave peace to the fold, and the fathers met in general Council for the first time since the Council of Jerusalem, it was found that they numbered 318, and most of them were from the East; and this, in spite of the slaughters of Diocletian and Maximian, only twelve years previous. In Rome, the cross was now

(1) *On the Crowns*, Hymn XL.

(2) *Apology*, last chap.

publicly revered ; it shone upon the flags of the army, and upon the crown of the sovereign. And to what was due the wonderful vitality and progress of the Church which then astonished the world ? We shall prove that such progress was impossible to human means, that to God alone it must be attributed. Firstly, what was the character of the age during which this progress was attained ?

From the time of Augustus, when Christianity first appeared, Rome was the mistress of the world. Her victories in the East had brought to her immense wealth and this wealth entailed a luxury, a refinement of vice, which made Juvenal sigh for the days of Roman poverty (1). It is difficult for us to believe all that incontestable evidence reveals of the corruption of all classes under the Pagan Cæsars. An avaricious and cruel aristocracy, a brutal and gluttonous people ; men without honor, and women who had not even the knowledge of what modesty should be. If scarcely one of the many Roman empresses was an ordinarily decent woman, it would be hard to draw an exaggerated picture of general society. The philosophy which Rome received from Greece helped on the infection. Whether Stoic, and puffed up with arrogance, or Epicurean, and given to voluptuousness, the average Roman was a thorough philosophaster. Rome was filled with the *dilettanti* of letters ; her schools, rostrums, and palaces, resounded with the grandiloquent precepts of teachers who only added to the general corruption. Adrian philosophized to-day, to-morrow he will weep for Antinous like a school-girl. In matter of religion, the Rome of the Cæsars was superstitious, but religion was respected. Everything was acceptable to the religion of the empire ; Christ would have been enrolled among the divinities had the Christians consented. Religion was a vast machine. At its head was the sovereign as Supreme Pontiff ; the temples and their furniture were magnificent in the extreme. Foolish and impious as it was, the Roman religious system powerfully influenced all classes ; both public and private life were permeated by it, either from policy or superstition. Such was the Rome

(1) 6th Satire, v. 292.

of Augustus and his successors ; cultivated to excess, in matter of art and science, but immersed in luxury and parade ; dominated by a religion which attracted men because it favored every depraved appetite, and checked no raging passion. Now, looking at the matter from a human point of view, was it likely that success would crown the effort of a system like Christianity to obtain the mastery in such a society ? When Sts. Peter and Paul entered the Eternal City they declared implacable war upon all the deities under whose care the little hamlet of Romulus had become the mistress of the nations. Capitoline Jove, before whom the conquerors of the earth bent the knee after a triumph, was spoken of by these despised Jews as a nobody. All the other deities were also nobodies, or perhaps demons. The temples were sublime follies ; the priests, vile impostors ; the Supreme Pontiff, at best a stage manager. From Cæsar on his throne, down to the veriest slave, how would the Romans naturally receive such teachings, and from such men ? And if the proud Quirites consented to put out their sacred fires, what kind of a worship did these Jews propose to substitute for that of majestic Jupiter and lovely Venus ? A few years before there had lived in pitiful Judea a man called Jesus, a man of no wealth or of what the Roman would call "standing ;" this obscure Jew had styled himself the Son of God, and, at the request of his countrymen, had been crucified by the Roman governor, and between two thieves. What a god to propose to the philosophy of Rome ! And what was the system of morality inculcated by these foreign adventurers ? A people who made a virtue of love of glory were to embrace instead the practice of humility. They were to cherish purity, to whom lechery was as the breath of their nostrils, and whose gods were its prime promoters. Forgiveness of injury was to be the ordinary thing among those who regarded revenge as oftentimes a sacred duty. And so on through the whole catalogue of precepts. As Valsecchi well says, "It was as little to be expected that such a law would be received in Rome during the time of the Cæsars, as it was natural to see the carnal and bloody religion of the impostor Mohammed

accepted by the Saracens of Asia. . . . This latter system was in unison with the brutal propensities of those peoples, and therefore it was received; the former was entirely opposed to the disposition of the Romans, therefore, humanly speaking, it was not to be established." And what consequences accrued to the profession of Christianity in those days? In the first place, the convert was proclaimed by all as impious, as an enemy of Cæsar and of society, as the vilest of the vile. Listen to Tacitus: "He (Nero) punished, in a most curious manner, those hated malefactors whom the vulgar call Christians . . . . . repressed for a while, the pestiferous superstition broke out again . . . . . even in the city, where everything atrocious and shameful flows, and is cultivated. First were taken the professing Christians, then a great number of those who were named, not as guilty of firing the city, but as enemies of the human race" (1). Suetonius (2) says, "Torments were visited upon the Christians, a set of men belonging to a new and pernicious superstition." Juvenal thinks he is very just when he styles the Christians *cerdones*, "vile mechanics." Cecilius (3) deemed them "uncivilized, and without culture, the vilest scum of the earth." Lucian regarded them as "idiots." A long string of like compliments may be found in the erudite work of Mamachi on Christian Antiquities, vol. 1, c. 2 and 3, but these will suffice to show what the refined gentleman and delicate lady convert had to anticipate in those days from their former associates. Tertullian tells us (4) that in consequence of Pagan calumnies, "Every public calamity and every popular trouble was attributed to the Christians. If the Tiber rises above its banks, if the Nile does not overflow, if the skies are not clear, if the earth quakes, if famine or pestilence come, up goes the cry, 'The Christians to the Lions.'" Now, does the reader think it likely, humanly speaking, that people of every condition, age, and sex, in so brilliant and refined an age, would have rushed to join a sect so vilified and persecuted, and that too for the sake of a doctrine contrary

(1) *Annals*, B. 15, c. 44.(2) *Nero*, 16.(3) MINUTIUS FELIX, *Octav.*, c. 24.(4) *Apology*, c. 40.

to their secret and dearest inclinations? And remember, a few may be guilty of gross extravagance, and of transcendent fanaticism, but here it is a question of millions of all classes, nobles and commoners, rough soldiers and delicate women, the philosophers and the ignorant octogenarians and tender children.

Had the first apostles of Christianity been helped by military force, or by the allurements of an easy and self-petting religion, or even by an extraordinary eloquence of their own, they might possibly have been expected, humanly speaking, to succeed. But God wished to take from them even these human aids. Origen makes a remark very apposite to this point (1). "It seems to me that if Jesus had chosen for the work of teaching, those who, in the opinion of the vulgar, were wise, and fit by knowledge and speech to captivate the good graces of the multitude, He would not have escaped the suspicion of instituting a new school, like the philosophers, for his own reputation." The twelve apostles chosen by Christ were men possessed of not even the first rudiments of education; this fact was so well known to the Pagans that Origen says that Celsus conceded it without hesitation (2). They were Jews, and therefore hated; fishermen, and therefore poor; foreign plebeians, and therefore lacking in Latin and Greek culture. Yet they go into the most cultivated, as well as into the most barbarous places of the earth, and without art or metaphor preach a new and difficult doctrine, which is accepted by millions. They teach what the world's philosophy must regard as folly, but their folly conquers philosophy. The first argument of their every discourse is the cross,—the scandal of the Hebrews and the foolishness of the Gentiles. They fail, indeed, but their doctrine triumphs.

The rapid propagation of Christianity is an historical fact which no one denies. The resistance of the Pagan world was the greatest possible, on account of the natural opposition between its genius and that of the new system; it was exercised too in the most ferociously determined manner, as we know from the consequences entailed by con-

(1) *Against Celsus*, b. 1.

(2) *Ibid.*

version to Christianity. Now, the force opposed by the Church to this Pagan resistance was, humanly speaking, the smallest possible, for her doctrines were not alluring to human nature, and her apostles were absolutely deficient in all human aids to success. Therefore, to conclude with Valsecchi, whose argument we have appropriated, since it is an axiom that the effect must be zero where the force is at the minimum, and the resistance at the maximum, we must admit that according to all human ideas the Christian religion should have been, from the outset, a failure. But it was nevertheless successfully propagated, therefore it was the work of God. We may well use the words of Richard of St. Victor: "If, O Lord, my faith were an error—which is an impossibility—Thou art the deceiver, for Thou hast permitted that Christianity should be marked by signs which plainly show the imprint of Thy omnipotent hand." (1)

(1) St. Augustine, in his *City of God*, b. 22, c. 5, makes these apposite remarks: "Here we notice three incredible things. It is incredible that Christ rose from the dead; that the world should have believed in His resurrection; that a small number of men, and men, too, from the dregs of the people, should have persuaded, even wise persons, of the fact. Of these three incredible things, our adversaries refuse to believe the first. They see the second with their own eyes, and they can only account for it by admitting the third. The resurrection of Christ is published and believed in the entire world. If it is incredible, why does the universe credit it? Had a large number of learned and distinguished men testified to this miracle, asserting that they had beheld it, it would not have been wonderful, had the world believed in it; but when we know that the world has credited it, on the testimony of a few obscure and ignorant persons, how is it that there are yet found men so obstinate as to discredit that which has been received by an entire world? . . . . . If people will not believe that the Apostles performed miracles in testimony of the resurrection of Christ, they ask us to believe in a greater miracle, namely, that the whole world did believe without a miracle."

Cantù says that while we cannot accept as absolutely true the remark of Justin Martyr (*Dial. Trypho*, n. 117) as to the universal spread of Christianity in his day, yet: "It is certain that Christianity spread with a rapidity, which, considering the obstacles that it encountered, proves its divinity. Besides Judea, Italy, Greece, and Egypt, the provinces between the Euphrates and the Ionian were cultivated by Paul; the *Apocalypse* speaks of the seven Asiatic churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Thyatira, Sardis, Laodicea, and Philadelphia; in Syria, the churches of Damascus, Berea (Aleppo), and Antioch, were illustrious; Cyprus, Crete, Thrace, and Macedonia received the Apostles who spread the truth in the ancient republics of Corinth, Sparta, and Athens. From Edessa, where many embraced it, Christianity was propagated in the Greek and Syriac cities which obeyed the successors of Artaxerxes, in spite of the solid hierarchy, and the exclusiveness of the Persian system. The Great Armenia received it very early from the neighboring Syria, although the kingdom was not entirely converted until the fourth century. . . . . The Synagogue, the emperors, the proconsuls, persecute them? If weak, they fly; if not, they suffer, but they do not yield. . . . It is true that the Romans were used to daily executions, to gladiatorial combats, to Stoical suicides; but the victims of all these either were forced to die, or they threw down life as an insupportable burden—at least they died with indifference, being satiated with life. Among the Christians, on the contrary, death was met by women, children, and old men, not with the haughty dignity of the schools, but with simplicity, and without ostentation."—*Unt. Hist.*, b. 6, c. 26.

## CHAPTER V.

### ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS OF THE FIRST CENTURY.

Some of the writings which have come down to us as of the first century (1) are clearly of a later date; others again have been proved to be forgeries; some, however, are undoubtedly authentic. We shall briefly treat of those which are the most frequently quoted or consulted, either by Catholic authors or their opponents, as fountains of history. First in order of importance, if it were authentic, comes the letter said to have been written by our Lord to Abgar, king of Edessa, in Mesopotamia. Eusebius (2) tells us that this prince addressed an epistle to Christ, begging him to come to him and cure him of a malady; that the Saviour replied, promising to send one of his disciples; that, after the Ascension, St. Thomas sent St. Thaddeus, who performed the cure and converted the people of Edessa. The historian gives the whole letter of Christ, and says that he found it in the ancient annals of Edessa. St. Ephrem, who was a deacon of Edessa, also speaks of the epistle. Count Darius, writing to St. Augustine; Evagrius (3), St. John Damascene (4), and the 7th General Council (5), are cited by the friends of the epistle, as mentioning it and regarding it as authentic.

Tillemont, the Anglican Cave, and a few other critics, accept it. But, as Bergier well remarks (6), the authenticity of this letter need not give much concern to a theologian,

(1) Besides the books of the New Testament, we have the following: A letter of Christ to Abgar, king of Edessa, and one of that prince to our Lord; Liturgies ascribed to Sts. Peter, James, Matthew, and Mark; Acts of Sts. Paul and Thecla; The Apocryphal Gospels according to the Egyptians, Hebrews, Sts. Peter, James, Thomas, and Matthias; Acts of Sts. Peter and Paul, Andrew, John, Philip, and Thomas; Revelations of Sts. Paul and Thomas; Apocalypse of St. Peter; Epistle of St. Paul to Seneca; and of Seneca to St. Paul; Epistle of St. Paul to the Laodiceans; Writings of Prochorus (one of the seven deacons), Linus, and Abdias; Epistle of St. Barnabas; Book of the Pastor; Passion of St. Andrew by the Clergy of Achaia; Epistles of St. Martial; Epistles of Pope St. Clement; Epistle of St. Polycarp; Encyclical Epistle of the Church of Smyrna; Writings of St. Dionysius the Areopagite; Epistles of St. Ignatius, Martyr; Canons of the Apostles; Apostolic Constitutions; Canons of the Apostolic Council of Antioch.

(2) Book 1, c. 13.

(3) Book 4, c. 26.

(4) Orthodox Faith, b. 4, c. 17.

(5) *Action* 5.

(6) Art. *Abgar*

“for upon it depends no fact, no dogma, no point of morality.” Pope Gelasius, in a Synod of 70 Bishops, held at Rome in 494, pronounced the correspondence apocryphal, and certainly if the letter of Christ is authentic, it is difficult to understand why it has not been included in the Canon of Scripture. Alexandre uses this argument, and adds, among others, the following. None of the Gospels were written during the sojourn of Christ upon earth, and yet, in His alleged letter to Abgar, He is represented as quoting the Gospel. Again, Abgar writes to our Lord that His fame has reached Edessa; now, the letter bears date of the 430th year of the Edessenes, which was the 15th of Tiberius, the year in which St. John commenced his mission, and at that period fame had not yet become occupied with the name of Jesus. Finally, if the early fathers had regarded this correspondence as authentic, they would not have omitted, as they did, to adduce it against the Arians; for in it the divinity of Christ is explicitly asserted. As for the testimony of Sts. Ephrem and John Damascene, of Evagrius, and of the 7th Council, we can only say that these fathers were mistaken in their judgment. St. Jerome, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, makes no allusion whatever to the Abgar correspondence. And it is to be noted that Count Darius, writing to St. Augustine, speaks of these letters as of dubious authenticity; that St. John Damascene does not allude to any letter of Christ to Abgar, but to a portrait of our Lord sent to the prince (1); that the same is to be observed as to the testimony of the 7th Council.

The *Canons of the Apostles* purport to be disciplinary regulations of the primitive Church, and are 85 in number. Torriani, in a book written against the Centuriators of Magdeburg, ascribes them all to the Apostles. Bellarmine, Baronio, and Possevin, hold that the first 50 are authentic. Bini accepts all but the 65th and 84th. Daillé (2), and

(1) “History tells us that when Abgar, king of Edessa, sent a painter to take a portrait of our Lord, the artist could not fulfil the task on account of the effulgence of His face; that our Lord Himself then pressed his garment to His divine and life-giving countenance, thereby affixing His likeness upon it, which He sent to Abgar.”

(2) *Apostolic Pseudopigraphs*, b. 3.

many other Protestant authors, contend that all these Canons are supposititious, and that they were not known before the fourth, and perhaps the fifth, century. Protestant writers would naturally be hostile to them, for they are manifestly opposed to many Protestant doctrines. In them we discover that the early Church believed in preeminence of bishops; we read of "altars" and of "sacrifice"; we observe that regulations were made for the administration of the Eucharist, for Penance, &c

The Anglican Beveridge (1), holds, however, that these Canons were established by bishops and synods in the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Alexandre (2) contends that the eastern churches accepted them in the beginning of the sixth century; that the western churches received the first 50 at the same period; that the entire collection is supposititious; that, nevertheless, they are very ancient, and were in great part drawn up in 258, by the Synod of Iconium, over which Firmilian presided. Those who hold that the Apostles and the Apostolic fathers had no part in the framing of these Canons, rely upon the following arguments. Pope Gelasius I. declared them apocryphal. Cardinal Hubert, legate of Pope Leo IX. to Constantinople, rejected them when Nicetas cited them in support of his opposition to the Saturday fast. "We disdain," says Hubert, "to listen to these fabulous traditions." Had the early Church regarded these Canons as authentic, contends Alexandre, they would have been inserted in the Canon of Scripture. The Ecclesiastical authors of the first four centuries are silent as to these documents, even in circumstances in which their existence would have been very beneficial to the cause of truth. Words occur in these Canons which are utterly foreign to the style of the Apostles, e. g., Cleric, Lector, Chanter, Priest (*Sacerdos*), Laic, First among Bishops (for a Metropolitan), the Hyperberetæan Month (for October) (3). In Canons 46, 47, and 67, we find a denial of the validity of Baptism conferred by heretics. Canon 7 prohibits the celebration of a Pasch "with the Jews," and yet the conduct

(1) *Canons of the Early Church.* (2) *History; Cent. I., Diss. 18, prop. 1, 2, and 3.*

(3) This was the Syro-Macedonic word for October.

of the bishops of Asia Minor in the Paschal Controversy implies utter ignorance of this ordinance. And why did not Pope Victor cite this canon, when these prelates defended their course as upheld by Apostolic tradition? Canon 65 deposes any cleric, and excommunicates any layman, who fasts on Saturday; yet it is certain that in the very city of Rome, at least in the fourth century, Saturday was a fast-day (1), and that St. Augustine doubted whether or not it was so observed by the Apostles. In Canon 84, the Books of Scripture are mentioned, and among them, we find three Books of Macchabees, two Epistles of Clement, and eight Books of Constitutions; there are wanting in the list, Wisdom, Tobias, Judith, Ecclesiastes, Esdras, and the Apocalypse. In Canons 21, 22, and 23, no one is allowed admission to the ranks of the clergy who has been guilty of self-mutilation; a cleric who is thus guilty, after admission, is deposed; a layman is excluded from communion for three years. It is very unlikely that this crime was committed in the time of the Apostles; we certainly know of no instance. And in after years, when the indiscreet zeal of a few impelled them to it, and the ecclesiastical authorities forbade it, we find no citation of an Apostolic canon in defence of the prohibition (2). To these arguments against the authenticity of the Apostolic Canons, Torriani, Bellarmine, and Baronio, respond in some instances, with considerable plausibility (3). It is very improbable, says Bergier (4), that Sts. Peter, John, James, and Mark made no regulations for the government of their respective dioceses of Rome, Ephesus, Jerusalem, and Alexandria. And in these cities, synods were held during the second and third centuries; the attending prelates would naturally follow the Apostolic regulations, and having embodied them, they soon styled them Apostolic Canons. They are apocryphal, inasmuch as they were drawn up, neither by the Apostles, nor by St. Clement, whose name they bear. But they are

(1) ST. AUGUSTINE; *Epist.* 36 to *Casulanus*. CASSIAN; *Monasteries*, b. 3, c. 10. SOCRATES . *h.* 5, c. 2.

(2) The instance of Origen, thanks to Demetrius, was made notorious, but he was not deposed. Theoctistus, Alexander, "and the bishops of the whole world," who, according to Eusebius, knew of Origen's fault, would certainly have obeyed an Apostolic canon.

(3) See ALEXANDER . *loc. cit.*

(4) *Art. Canons*.

authoritative, inasmuch as they present us the discipline, which, in the second and third centuries, was believed to have been established by the Apostles.

The *Apostolic Constitutions* are a collection of regulations bearing the name of Pope St. Clement. Nearly all critics agree that they are supposititious, that they were unknown before the fourth or fifth century. Bellarmine says (1) that "In them there are many useful things, and by the olden Greeks they were highly esteemed. But in the Latin Church they are almost of no account, and even the later Greeks, in the Trullan synod, *can.* 2, rejected them as corrupted by heretics . . . . . I understand that the Ethiopians use these *Constitutions* as though they were really Apostolic, and that, for that very reason, they err in their observance of Saturday and Sunday, in regard to the minister of the Sacrament of Baptism, and in certain other doctrines . . . . . In these same *Constitutions* there are not a few things contrary to truth." The erudite Christian Lupus (2) reminds us that "the Catalogue of St. Jerome makes no mention of them, and St. Gelasius, in his Roman synod, rejects them as apocryphal; the whole Latin Church has always held the same opinion. In our own times, Cardinals Baronio, Bellarmine, Perron; Gabriel d'Aubespine (Albaspinaeus), the learned bishop of Orleans, believe the same. Charles Bovius, therefore, and Francis Torriani might have used their time to better advantage than in an attempt to vindicate them. Thomas Stapleton wrongly declares them to be full of the Apostolic spirit, and worthy of a place in the Scriptural Canon . . . . . The book was issued by some unknown Arian of the 4th century, and it errs in dogma and in liturgy." However, in spite of the Arianism, anachronisms, and other faults of these *Constitutions*, they are valuable as sources of information on many disciplinary and liturgical points. Such is the judgment of Grabe, Beveridge, and other Protestant authors. Mosheim holds, in one place, that they are the works of the 3d century; in another, he assigns their origin to the second

(1) *Ecclesiastical Writers*, art. *Clement*.

(2) *Notes to the 2nd Canon of the Trullan Synod*.

Whiston (1) employs much erudition in trying to prove them the work of St. Clement, at the dictation of the Apostles. Alexandre (2) contends that they are apocryphal, and at variance with the teachings of the Church. Bergier believes that the first books were compiled some centuries before the 8th. Roncaglia thinks that at the time of St. Epiphanius, who praises the *Constitutions*, they were incorrupted, but that, soon afterwards, they were vitiated (3).

The *Epistles of St. Clement* (4) come next in order of importance. Some of these are unanimously rejected by all critics, both Catholic and Protestant, but the two *Epistles to the Corinthians* are undoubtedly authentic. The first has come down to us entire, while we have only a fragment of the second. With regard to the first, St. Dionysius of Corinth, only seventy years after it was written, tells the Romans that, from time immemorial, it was customary to read it in his church (5), Sts. Irenaeus (6), Clement of Alexandria (7), Cyril of Jerusalem (8), Ephanius (9), and Jerome (10), cite it and praise it. Origen (11) also speaks of it. Eusebius (12) says that it is approved by the judgment of all. The learned Presbyterian, Nathaniel Lardner (13), thinks it was written about the year 96, immediately after the persecution of Domitian. Alexandre assigns the same date, noting that the author, in chapters 1, 5, and 6, alludes to a persecution other than that of Nero, which must have been that of Domitian. It has been asserted that Eusebius in his *Book 3*, c. 36, St. Jerome, and Photius, absolutely rejected the *2nd Epistle*; that the first betrays an ignorance unworthy of St. Clement. Eusebius does not reject the *2nd Epistle*; he simply says that it is "less known" than the first.

(1) This author, now best known by his translation of Josephus, was the successor of Newton at Cambridge. Becoming an Arian in 1710, he was deprived of his chair, and finally joined the Baptists.

(2) *Cent. I., Diss. XIX.*

(3) There are several instances of inconsistency in the *Constitutions*, which would indicate the presence of a tampering hand. Thus, they sometimes permit the observance of the Pasch with the Jews, and sometimes prohibit it.

(4) The Epistles of the other Pontiffs, down to Siricius, will receive attention in the chapter devoted to the *False Decretals of Isidore Mercator*.

(5) EUSEBIUS; *b. 4, c. 14.*

(6) *Heresies*, *b. 3, c. 3.*

(7) *Stromaton*, *b. i, 4, 6.*

(8) *Catechism*, 18.

(9) *Heresy*, *27, n. 6.*

(10) *Ecclesiastical Writers*, *art. Clement.*

(11) *Princip.*, *b. 2, c. 3.*

(12) *B. 3, c. 12.*

(13) *Credibility of the Gospel History*, *v. 3.*

Photius, in his *Codex*, 113, and St. Jerome, in his *Catalogue*, both seem to discredit its authenticity, but they do not there give their own opinion, but that which Eusebius appears to favor. When, indeed, they speak for themselves, as Photius does in *Codex*, 126, and St. Jerome, *against Jovin.*, b. 1, c. 7, they both acknowledge the *2nd Epistle* as genuine. The charge of ignorance is hinted by Photius, in his *Codex*, 126, saying, "Some may blame him because he admits the existence of other worlds beyond the ocean; because he adduces the story of the phoenix as a certain fact; because he gives to Jesus Christ merely the title of high-priest and ruler, not using the more eminent titles which belong to His divinity." As for the admission of "other worlds," this is only another argument against those who assert that the Fathers deny the existence of the antipodes. Origen (1) interprets St. Clement as meaning regions beyond the ocean, and agrees with him. St. Hilary does the same (2). As to the fable of the phoenix, its mention by the author of the *Epistles* is no proof that he regarded it as a fact, or used it in any other sense than as an illustration of our resurrection, as did Origen, Tertullian, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Lactantius, St. Gregory of Nazianzen, and many other Fathers. The insinuation that the writer did not believe in the divinity of Christ is shown to be unfounded by the commencement of the second letter, where our Saviour is called God, the Judge of the living and the dead.

The book of *Recognitions*, ascribed to St. Clement, is cited by Origen (3) and by several early writers; nevertheless, it must be classed among the apocryphal. St. Epiphanius (4) is of opinion that St. Clement wrote these *Recognitions* and other works ascribed to him, but that they were corrupted by the Ebionites. Rufinus, in his book on the corruption of the works of Origen, forms the same judgment. Eusebius, and Sts. Jerome and Athanasius also reject them. Two entire pages of the *Recognitions*, observes Alexandre, are taken, word for word, from the book on *Fate*, written by Bardesanes the Syrian, who flourished under Marcus Anto-

(1) *Princip.*, b. 2, c. 3.  
(2) *Psalms II.*, n. 25.

(3) *Tract 35, on Matthew.*  
(4) *Heresies*, 30.

ninus (161–180), certainly sixty years after the death of St. Clement.

The *Epistle of St. Polycarp to the Philippians* is a valuable document. Its author was a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, was made bishop of Smyrna, and was martyred about the year 169. The doctrine of the Real Presence and that of Holy Orders are plainly presented, and hence Protestants would gladly show it to be spurious. But even Le Clerc (1) entertains no doubt as to its authenticity. Daillé, in his anxiety to discredit the authority of the letters of St. Ignatius, which Polycarp sustains, alleges some flimsy arguments against it, which are refuted by Pearson, in his *Vindication of Ignatius*, chap. 5. Mosheim (2) thinks it is not easy to decide whether or not the *Epistle* is authentic. The following words of St. Irenaeus (3) speak well for its genuineness. "And Polycarp, not only instructed by the Apostles, and associated with many of those who saw our Lord, but also made bishop of Smyrna in Asia, by the Apostles, whom we ourselves saw, in our early age. . . . . There exists a most perfect Epistle of Polycarp, written to the Philippians, from which those who wish, and who have regard for their salvation, may learn the quality of his faith and the preaching of truth." Eusebius (4) and St. Jerome (5) also praise this letter. Some have impugned its authority, because it seems to be guilty of inconsistency; in one place, they say St. Ignatius is mentioned as living, while again he is spoken of as "in his due place, with God." But the holy martyr is not spoken of as still living; at least, that is not necessarily the sense of the passage. St. Polycarp requests the Philippians "to inform him of what they know for certain about Ignatius, and those who are with him." The *Acts* of the martyr tell us that he passed through Philippi on his way to death, and that the Philippians, as was customary in such cases, sent messengers to honor and console him. When these returned to their companions, they certainly had much to narrate, and St. Polycarp wished to be informed of everything. The knowledge of the saint's

(1) *History*, y. 117.

(2) *Hist., Cent. I.*, p. 2, c. 2, § 21.

(3) *Heresies*, b. 3, c. 3.

(4) *B.* 3, c. 30, and *b.* 4, c. 13.

(5) *Eccles. Writers*, art. *Polycarp*.

last moments, of the disposition of his body, etc., reached Macedonia before it did Smyrna; it was natural then for St. Polycarp to apply to the Philippians for information. The authority of Nicephorus of Constantinople and of Anastasius the Librarian is also adduced against our *Epistle*. But the opinion of Anastasius, who flourished in the ninth century, is not of first importance, when contrary to that of Irenaeus, Eusebius, Jerome, Bede, and of all the Asiatic churches, who, for many centuries, solemnly read this *Epistle* in their services. As for Nicephorus, his judgment was not so good as that of his contemporary, the learned Photius, who, though he rejected the letter of St. Clement, had nothing to allege against that of St. Polycarp. Again, the *Stichometria* of Nicephorus, cited against us, does not speak of the *Epistle*, but of the *Didaschalia* of St. Polycarp. Finally, even though the *Epistle* were quoted by the author of the *Stichometria*, no argument can be drawn therefrom, for the writer does not pronounce the document spurious; he merely says that it is to be placed among the apocrypha of the Bible, that is, to be excluded from the Canon of Scripture, which is very different from banishing it from the company of authentic works (1).

The *Encyclical Epistle of the Church of Smyrna* inserted by Cotelier among the *Works of the Apostolic Fathers*, was written after the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, and is not impugned by any author of note. It is valuable for the testimony it bears to the veneration of martyrs and their relics on the part of the primitive Church.

St. Dionysius (Denis), the Areopagite, is believed by many to have been the author of the following works: *The Celestial Hierarchy*, *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, *The Divine Names*, *Mystic Theology*, and ten *Epistles*. The state of the question in regard to these books is well explained by Alexandre (2), at the beginning of his apposite dissertation: "It is certain that no one has spoken of these works as

(1) It may be observed, with Alexandre, that the cited *Stichometria* was not written by the patriarch Nicephorus, nor by any author of the 9th century. At that time, the Greeks did not doubt of the canonicity of the books of *Esther*, *Judith*, and *Wisdom*, as does the writer of this book.

(2) *Cent. I., Diss. XXII.*

written, either by Dionysius or by any other Father, before the beginning of the fifth century. Secondly, it is certain that, in the following centuries, the Fathers, the Councils, the Pontiffs, and all the Ecclesiastical writers, down to Erasmus (one alone, an anonymous, excepted), ascribed them to Dionysius the Areopagite. Thirdly, it is certain that there are grave reasons for denying that they are by Dionysius the Areopagite, and for assigning them to an author of the fifth century; by which reasons Launoy and Morin were persuaded to adopt that opinion. However, though it is fortified so strongly, I would rather defend the contrary opinion, which declares St. Dionysius the Areopagite to be the legitimate parent of these books; it has so many arguments in its favor, that I deem it not less probable than the other, and would prefer to defend it, with the Œcumenical Councils and the Holy Fathers on my side, than to embrace the other, under the leadership of the doubtful Erasmus, and Daillé, Blondel, and other heterodox authors, together with the most learned Morin and Launoy." Nothing will better show the diversity of opinion among Catholic critics, concerning these writings, than a comparison of this passage of the great historian and critic with one of Berquier (1). "It is certain that the works, which bear the name of St. Dionysius the Areopagite, are not those of the holy bishop of Athens, but the real author is unknown. Critics differ as to the period when they first appeared. . . . . The first authentic mention of them is at the conference held in 532, in the palace of the emperor Justinian, between the Catholics and the Severians; the latter quoted them in their own favor, the former upheld their orthodoxy, and from that time many Fathers of the Church have sustained their authoritativeness. Mosheim and Brucher deem the *Mystic Theology* the work of a fanatical Platonist, who, in place of the reasonable religion of the Gospel, substitutes a chimerical devotion, consisting of prayers, vigils, and macerations of the body; making lazy contemplation the perfection of Christianity—an absurd doctrine, which has

(1) Art. *Dionysius*.

produced great abuses in the Church"(1). The book on the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* is also displeasing to Protestants, for it bears witness to the ancient use of rites and ceremonies, and to the "Discipline of the Secret." So grave are the authorities adduced by both parties to this controversy, and so weighty are some of the arguments used by each, that we can do no better than summarize their respective reasons, leaving the student to his own good judgment thereon. In the first place, thirteen centuries of possession, during which time these books have been ascribed to the Areopagite, by Fathers, by Pontiffs, and by Councils, no other author being put forward as claimant, militate for their authenticity. They are cited as works of our Dionysius by Juvenal of Jerusalem (2), who lived in the fifth century; by Leontius (3), when combating the *Aphthartocetes*, or asserters of the incorruptibility of the flesh of Christ; by the Monothelites, with no contradiction on the part of the Catholics (4); by Sophronius of Jerusalem, the first opponent of the Monothelites (5); by Pope St. Martin I. in the Council of Lateran (6); by St. Maximus, disputing with the Monothelite, Pyrrhus; by the 6th General Council, in *Action* 8; by Pope Agatho, writing to Constantine Pogonatus; by St. Gregory the Great (7); by Pope Adrian I., in his letter to Charlemagne on the Seventh Council; by Pope Nicholas I., addressing the emperor Michael; by Hincmar of Rheims and Anastasius, writing to Charles the Bald; by Photius, one of the most rigid, as well as one of the most learned of critics (8); by St. John Damascene (9); by St. Thomas of Aquin (10); by the erudite Cardinal Bessarion (11). Secondly, the author of these books speaks of himself in a way that indicates him to have been a contemporary of the Apostles. Thus (12) he calls himself a disciple of St. Paul; he declares that he was present at the obsequies of the Blessed Virgin, together with Sts. Peter and James (13); he says he witnessed the disappearance of the

(1) *Ibi*. (2) NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS; *History*, b. 15, c. 14. (3) *Against Nestorius and Eutyches*, b. 2. (4) *Gen. Council of Constantinople (3rd)*, *Action* 2. (5) *Epistle to Sergius*. (6) *Sec. 1 and 3*. (7) *Homily 34, on St. Luke's Gospel*. (8) *Coder*, 231. (9) *Orthodox Faith*, b. 1, c. 15. (10) *Sentences II.*, dist. 10, q. 1, art. 12. (11) *Platonic Defence*, b. 2, c. 3. (12) *Divine Names*, c. 2. (13) *Ibi*, c. 3.

sun on the death of Christ (1). Finally, the great Erasmus, the leader of the opponents of the Dionysian claims, could adduce, in favor of his theory, only the names of Lorenzo Valla and William Grocinius. Against the authenticity of these works, Theodore, an author much praised by Photius, proposes four questions, and answers them. First, why do none of the Fathers quote the works of the Areopagite? This is answered by a denial of the supposition. Second, how is it that Eusebius, enumerating the writings of the Fathers, does not mention those of Dionysius? St. Maximus Martyr replies that Eusebius tells us that many of such writings had not reached him, and Alexandre observes that Eusebius makes no mention of the works of Athenagoras, which are celebrated, and of undoubted authenticity. Third, how is it that, while Dionysius was a contemporary of the Apostles, he alludes to traditions which arose in after times? To this the friends of the Dionysian claims reply that it is false that said traditions were not from Apostolic days; that the persecutions of the early days had prevented the use of much of the ceremonial, which was nevertheless of Apostolic origin, and they cite St. Basil (2), saying, "We bless the water of Baptism, and the oil of Unction, and also him who is baptized; but on (the authority of) what writings? Is it not from silent and secret tradition? Where is the triple immersion found in Scripture? And the other things performed in Baptism, such as the renunciation of Satan and his angels, from what Scripture do we drive them? Is it not from this unpublished and hidden tradition? . . . . . In this manner, the Apostles and the Fathers, who, in the first days of the Church, prescribed certain rites, preserved in silence the dignity of the Mysteries." Fourth, how is it that St. Dionysius cites the *Epistle* of St. Ignatius to the Romans, when the former was martyred under Domitian, and the latter suffered under Trajan, and wrote his *Epistle* just before his death? Alexandre believes that this citation is an interpolation, but it is unnecessary to recur to such a supposition, as St. Dionysius did not suffer under Domitian, but in the last year of Trajan, or the

(1) *Epist.* 7, to Polycarp.(2) *Holy Ghost*, c. 27.

first of Adrian (1). It is also urged against the authenticity of these works that the author styles St. Timothy his son, an implication of superiority of which the holy Areopagite would not have been guilty. The reply to this objection is that there was no undue assumption, on the part of Dionysius, in so speaking of Timothy. St. Timothy was much younger than the Areopagite; St. Paul himself alludes to his extreme youth. A third objection is founded upon the mention, in the book on *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, of the monastic institution as already established, while, it is alleged, the ecclesiastical writers of the first two centuries do not speak of monks. Alexandre (2) replies at some length to this argument, and shows, that while the monastic state, as we now have it, did not exist for some time after St. Dionysius, yet, from Apostolic times, there were such monks as the Areopagite depicts; who were regarded as laics, and were subject to the bishops, and even to the priests; who, devoted to God, and free from earthly cares, lived, sometimes at home, often in community; to whom, immediately after the clergy, place was accorded in the sacred services (3). Morin urges, as against the authorship of St. Dionysius, that, in the book on the *Celestial Hierarchy*, the word *hypostasis* is used to signify "person," as distinct from essence; while we know, he says, that this term began to be so used, only after the synod of Alexandria of 362. To this may be answered that, nevertheless, the Areopagite may have so used it. There was certainly a first to adopt the term in the new sense; why should not he have been the one? He certainly understood the force of the word, and knowing that it admirably indicated those substances, which, in intelligent natures, we designate as "persons," it was quite natural for him, a sublime philosopher, to apply the term to the three Divine Persons, and style God, *Trishypostatos*, that is, a Being subsisting in Three Persons. But it is not true that the word *hypostasis* received its new signification after the synod of Alexandria in 362. St. Dionysius of Alexandria, in response to the fourth pro-

(1) Conf. SUIDAS, *Roman Martyrology*; Bede; *Ado of Vienne*.

(2) *Cent. I., diss.* 22.

(3) See the *Epistle of Dionysius to Demophilus*.

position of Paul of Samosata, says of the Persons of the Father and the Son, "They are two inseparable *hypostases*." St. Alexander, also of Alexandria, in a letter to Alexander of Constantinople (1), declares that "of the Father and the Son, there are two natures *in hypostasi*." And, according to St. Basil the Great (2), the Council of Nice (325) used the word *hypostasis* for "person" when, in its Exposition of Faith, it condemned those who asserted that the word "was made from another subsistence or substance." According to St. Gregory of Nyssa (3), when St. Paul, in *Hebrews, I.*, speaks of "the figure of His substance" (in the Greek, *character tis hypostaseos*), he used the word *hypostasis* for "person." Finally, as a member of the Areopagus, St. Dionysius was certainly well versed in the works of Aristotle, and that philosopher, in his work on *The World*, uses *hypostasis* in another sense than that of "essence." He says, "of those things which we observe in the air, some only appear, others *are*," the Greek text has "are *kath' hypostasin*." In the supposition that St. Dionysius was not the author of the works bearing his name, critics are at an utter loss to whom to ascribe them. The famous Dominican, Le Quien, in his edition of the writings of St. John Damascene, endeavors to prove that the unknown was a Monophysite heretic (4).

St. Ignatius, Martyr, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, and third bishop of Antioch, called by the olden Greeks *Theophorus*, because they believed him to have been the child embraced by the Saviour, *Matt.*, 18, 3, has been reputed the author of many works which are undoubtedly spurious. Thus, the *Epistles* addressed to the *Blessed Virgin*, and the two inscribed to *St. John*, those to *Mary Cassaboline*, to the *Tarsians*, to the *Antiochenes*, to *Hero*, and to the *Philippians*, give intrinsic evidence of their worthlessness, and are defended by none. But there are seven other *Epistles*

(1) THEODORET: *History*, b. 1, c. 3. (2) *Epistle* 78. (3) *Difference of Essence and Hypostasis*, written to Peter.

(4) Roncaglia, in his *2d Animadversion* to Alexander's dissertation on this subject, gives several additional reasons why these works should be deemed spurious. The most conclusive are 1st, the author explains the mystery of the Trinity even more clearly than is done by Athanasius: 3d, he alludes to no persecution of the Church; 3d, he quotes the Gospel and Apocalypse of St. John, which were composed in the old age of the Apostle, while the Areopagite tells us that his own works were of his younger days.

of St. Ignatius, addressed to the *Ephesians*, to the *Magnesi-ans*, to the *Trallians*, to the *Romans*, to the *Philadelphians*, to the *Smyrniotes*, and to *St. Polycarp*. These seven, as they are presented, according to the common Greek-Latin edition, in all but the very latest *Patrologies*, are interpolated and corrupted. This is shown by the fact that the passages of the *Epistles*, quoted by the ancient Fathers, are either not found in this edition, or are given in very different language; again, because there are many things therein foreign to the age of the reputed author. These same seven *Epistles*, however, as they are read in the editions formed from the Greek codex discovered by Isaac Voss in the Medicean Library, and from the two Latin MSS. found in England by Usher, are regarded as authentic by the best Protestant critics. De Saumaise, Daillé, Blondel, and some others, reject them. They certainly agree with the character of their reputed author, and with the genius of the age in which he lived; which is no slight argument in favor of their authenticity. They refute the heresies of his day; they use no testimony but that of Scripture; they speak of the Apostolic gifts yet flourishing in the Church; they are redolent of the simplicity of the Apostolic age, and betray an irrepressible yearning for the martyr's crown. These characteristics of the *Epistles* powerfully impressed the Anglican Pearson in their favor, and he devoted much of his diligence to their vindication. But there are not wanting more positive arguments for their authenticity. Many of the Fathers, and ancient Ecclesiastical writers, quote them as by Ignatius, and many speak of Ignatius' writings as showing the very characteristics which we observe in those before us. Thus, St. Polycarp (1) praises them as conducive to the spiritual profit of the reader; St. Irenaeus, according to Eusebius (2), quotes them several times; Origen (3), St. Athanasius (4), St. Jerome (5), Theodoret (6), and many others, mention one or more of them. Daillé objects that the *Epistles* of Ignatius were unknown to ecclesiastical writers before the time of Eusebius; that even St. Chrysos-

(1) *Epist. to Philippians*.(2) *Hist.*, b. 5, c. 8, and b. 3, c. 36(3) *Homily 6, on Luke*.(4) *Epist. on Synods of Rimini and Seleucia*.(5) *Eccles. Writers*.(6) *Dialogue: Immutabilis*.

tom, an Antiochian, ignored them; that the same may be said of Tertullian, who teaches things contrary to these writings; of St. Clement of Alexandria, who not only does not mention them, but even holds different opinions, on certain matters, from those expressed herein; of St. Epiphanius, who would have cited them against Aërius, a bitter enemy of the episcopal dignity, had he deemed them authentic. But because certain authors seem to ignore these Epistles, it by no means follows that all did so, and we know that the contemporaneous Polycarp and Irenæus approved of them. Again, how can Daillé, or any other critic, prove that the cited fathers ignored the *Epistles* of Ignatius? Their silence shows nothing, since we do not possess all of their works, and in those which have perished, there may have been some mention of these documents. As for the argument deduced from Tertullian's contrary teaching, if it avails anything, it shows equally well that he was unacquainted with the Gospels and Apostolic writings, for he sometimes contradicts even them (1). With regard to St. Clement of Alexandria, Daillé's reasoning is ineffective, for in none of his works does the holy bishop mention any author of the second century; not even Polycarp, Justin, Athenagoras, Dionysius, Hippolyte, Hegesippus, or Irenæus, of whose works Daillé certainly did not believe him ignorant or suspicious (2). To prove St. Clement's opinions diverse from those of St. Ignatius, Daillé adduces the former's assertion that the preaching of Christ lasted but one year, while the latter represents our Lord's mission as extending through three years. But this assertion of St. Ignatius is not found in the only reliable codices, viz., the Medicean and the Anglican. As to St. Epiphanius, Daillé can draw very little comfort from his silence, for he does not mention Papias, Hegesippus, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Agrippa, Caius, Dionysius, Miltiades, whose writings he must have read; and when he does cite an author, he never quotes his words in confutation of a

(1) Thus, in his book entitled an *Exhortation to Chastity*, he condemns second marriages as lecheries.

(2) In his *Stromata*, St. Clement Alex. only cites Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Hermes and Tatian.

heretic's doctrine, but rather uses him as an historian of that particular heresy. No wonder then that he does not adopt the *Epistle* of St. Ignatius against the teaching of Acrius. St. John Chrysostom gives no assistance to Daillé for though he does not expressly cite the *Epistles*, he quotes the words of the *Epistles to the Romans*, where the future martyr expresses his yearning for the crown (1).

The book entitled *The Pastor* seems to be authentic, and to have been written by Hermas, a disciple of St. Paul. It is divided into three parts, *Visions*, *Commandments*, and *Similitudes*. The edition of Cotelier, inserted in his *Apostolic Fathers*, and learnedly annotated, is by far the best we possess. Many Protestant critics dispute the genuineness of this work. In it we find an assertion of the free will of man, the doctrine of purgatory, and other Catholic dogmas. The authorship of *The Pastor* was ascribed to Hermas, a brother of Pope Pius I., by the unknown poet who wrote under the name of Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, b. 3; by the author of the *Epistles* assigned to Pope Pius I.; by Venerable Bede, and by Ado of Vienne. But a book, written by a brother of a Roman Pontiff, would scarcely have been almost unknown in the Western Church, as St. Jerome (2) says was the case with *The Pastor*; indeed, it would have acquired a greater notoriety in the West than in the East. (3). Brucker holds that *The Pastor* is the work of a fanatic, indoctrinated with the Platonic and Egyptian philosophies, and he bases his assertion upon the fact that Hermas teaches that each individual is attended by a good and an evil genius. Mosheim accuses this author of a pious fraud, in saying that he was instructed by an angel, and of declaring himself inspired, because he desired his book to be read in the churches—accusations certainly not sustained by the allegations. Le Clerc is more moderate in his opinion of Hermas, and even pretends to excuse some alleged errors. Origen identified this author with the person

(1) *Oration on the Martyrdom of St. Ignatius*.

(2) *Eccles. Writers*, art. *Hermas*.

(3) Mosheim contends that the identity of Hermas with the brother of Pope Pius I. is proved beyond doubt, by a fragment on the Scripture Canon published by Louis Anthony Muratori in his *Italian Antiquities of the Middle Ages*, and which he found in the Library of Milan.

spoken of by St. Paul, *Rom.*, xvi, 14, saying, "salute Her-mas." His work is cited with respect by Sts. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius, and by Tertullian and Eusebius.

Some of these authors, influenced, in all probability, by the purity of morals found in *The Pastor*, and by its simplicity of style, regard it as equal in authority to the writings of the Apostles, but Sts. Jerome and Prosper did not esteem it as valuable. Pope Gelasius, in 496, placed it among the apocrypha, but such a decision, of course, does not condemn the book as unworthy of respect; it simply means that it does not belong to the Canon of Scripture. Bergier thus repels the charge of pious cheating brought by Mosheim against Hermas: "Without any imposture, Hermas may have believed that his interlocutor was an angel; he may have believed, without wishing to claim any inspiration, that it was an angel who instructed him. He could have wished his book to be read in the churches, even though he did not place it on an equality with the Scriptures; for we know from the ancients that the first epistle of St. Clement was read there. . . . . The consequences which Mosheim draws from these facts are false, and only show his malignity." With regard to Brucker's opinion, Bergier asks: "What would this critic reply, if he were told that his patriarch, Luther, derived from the Orientals the opinion that man is like a horse, who goes where his rider directs? If he carries God, he goes where God wishes; if he carries Satan, he goes as Satan desires. Cotelier and Le Nourry have shown that this passage of Hermas is only an allegory, and that the basis of the idea may have been drawn from Scripture."

## CHAPTER VI

### CONVERSION OF GAUL AND QUESTION OF THE AREOPAGITE.

It is certain that the Gospel was preached in Gaul during the lifetime of the Apostles, although critics dispute as to whom should be awarded the merit of having first brought the saving tidings to the favored land which was destined to be the "eldest daughter of the Church." Some have thought that St. Philip the Apostle, St. Lazarus, and St. Denis the Areopagite, were the first evangelizers of Gaul. Others, however, relying on the testimony of Gregory of Tours, have contended that no churches were founded there before the third century; that then the see of Tours was established by Gratian, that of Arles by Trophimus, that of Narbonne by Paul, Limoge by Martial, Paris by Denis, Toulouse by Saturnine, Auvergne by Stremonius. The voyage of Lazarus and of St. Mary Magdalen is contested by many of the erudite, and that of the Areopagite is upheld by few modern writers. It is evident that the faith made little progress before the mission of St. Pothinus and his companions, which occurred in 177. From the acts of these Lyonesse martyrs, taken from the letter (supposed to have been written by St. Irenæus) of the churches of Lyons and Vienne to the faithful of Asia and Phrygia, we learn that about that time there were a great many Christians in those two cities. In this chapter we propose to show, first, that the French church was established in the first century; secondly, that a St. Denis the Areopagite was not the founder of the see of Paris.

St. Irenæus (d. 202), enumerating the churches which preserved that unity of tradition which furnishes so many proofs of the truth of our religion, has the following (1): "Although there are many different languages in the world, yet the power of Tradition is one and the same. There is no difference of belief or of Tradition in those churches

(1) *Heresies*, b. i. c. 2.

which have been founded in Germany or in Spain, or among the *Celts*, or in the East, or in Egypt; neither is there among those established in Libya, or in the middle of the world." In the time of St. Irenaeus, the inhabitants of Gaul were often called "*Celts*;" therefore, at that period there were Christian churches in Gaul. The same is proved by Tertullian (b. 150), speaking of the "various Getuli and many lands of the Moors, all the regions of Spain, and the different nations of Gaul," who had received the Gospel (1). Again, unless the Gospel had been successfully preached in Gaul before the third century, St. Justin (b. 103), in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, written about 139, would not have confidently asserted that there "was not one race of mortals, whether Barbarian or Greek, or called by any other name, among whom, through the name of Jesus crucified, are not offered prayers and thanksgiving to the Father and Maker of all things." Finally, we know that Trophimus was a disciple of St. Paul (*Acts*, and *2 Tim.*, 4); that Crescens was the same (Eusebius, *b. 3, c. 4*); that Paul was a "disciple of the Apostles" (St. Gregory the Great, *b. 7, epist. 29*); that Martial was ordained and commissioned by St. Peter (*Old Martyrologies*); and that these saintly missionaries respectively founded the churches of Arles, Vienne, Narbonne, and Limoges. The authority of St. Gregory of Tours is adduced by some to show that these prelates were sent to Gaul just before the Consulate of Decius and Gratus, that is, about the year 250. But this writer proves himself unreliable in many instances. Thus, among seven missionaries whom he represents as preaching the faith in Gaul in the third century, he places Saturninus of Toulouse, and notwithstanding this, he says (*Miracles*, *b. 1, c. 48*) that this bishop was "ordained by the disciples of the Apostles." Gregory also tells us (*Gloria of the Confessors*, *c. 8*) that St. Ursinus was ordained by the same disciples, and that he established the church of Biturica; and it is exceedingly improbable that the more celebrated cities would have been neglected. Gregory accounts for this tardy third century mission by the slow and limited propagation of the faith,

(1) *Against the Jews*, *c. 7.*

which is certainly repugnant to the testimony of Scripture, as well as to the evidence of Irenaeus and Tertullian. Dismissing, therefore, the objection founded on the allegations of Gregory as of no weight, we adduce in favor of the first century mission of Trophimus of Arles, the action of the bishops of the province of Vienne, in 450, in reference to the metropolitane claims of the church of Arles. This latter church had been deprived of its metropolitan privileges on account of the contumacy of Bishop Hilarius, who refused to obey the decree of Pope Boniface, restricting his jurisdiction within the province of Vienne. In a suppliant missive to Pope St. Leo I., the Viennese prelates requested the Pontiff to restore to the church of Arles the jurisdiction over both Narbonnes which, out of reverence to Trophimus, Pope Zosimus had conferred upon it. "It is known," they said, "to all the regions of Gaul, and it is not unknown to the Holy Roman Church, that, in all Gaul, the city of Arles first merited to have from the blessed Apostle Peter its priest St. Trophimus; and from it did the other Gallic countries derive the benefits of faith and religion." Had these bishops not been assured of the solidity of their position, they would not have used this argument with St. Leo. Had the church of Arles received the faith only in the third century, as Gregory of Tours asserts, the fraudulent claim, based on the first episcopacy of St. Trophimus, would have been repelled by Rome.

That St. Crescens preached the Gospel in Gaul during the first century, is also shown by excellent authority. Eusebius (1) writes: "Among the other disciples of Paul, Crescens is said to have been sent by him into Gaul." St. Epiphanius (2), speaking of St. Luke, says: "To him was entrusted the privilege of preaching the Gospel, which he exercised first in Dalmatia, Gaul, Italy, and Macedonia; but in Gaul first, as attests Paul in his Epistles in reference to some of his companions: 'Crescens,' he says, 'into Gaul;' we should not read 'into Galatia,' as some have im-

(1) *History*, b. 3, c. 4. The version of Christopherson has "in Galatia," but the Greek text, as derived from the best codices, and from Rufinus, has *ἐπὶ τὰς Γαλλίας*—"into the Gauls." The latter reading is defended by Valois, *On Timothy*, chap. 4.

(2) *Heresies*, no. 51.

properly done, but 'into Gaul.' Theodoret (1) says: "Crescens into Galatia:" for thus he named the Gauls. Thus they were anciently designated. Sophronius (2) tells us that "Crescens preached the Gospel in the Gauls." The Alexandrian Chronicle, 220th Olympiad, records: "Having promulgated the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, Crescens died under Nero, and was buried." Ado of Vienne writes in his *Martyrology*, under date of the 5th calends of July, "Into Galatia, the Blessed Crescens, disciple of St. Paul the Apostle; who, passing into the Gauls, converted many by the word of preaching. For some years he sat in Vienne, a city of the Gauls, and there ordained, as bishop for himself, his disciple Zachary. Returning however to the Galatians, the people to whom he had been especially given as bishop, he comforted them in the work of the Lord, unto the blessed end of his life." The same testimony is given in the Roman Martyrology, and in that of Usuardus (3).

The Gallic mission of St. Martial in the first century is proved by the authentic *Tabularia* and Offices of the Church of Limoges. That the tradition to this effect was regarded, from the earliest times, as well founded, is evinced from the epistle of Pope John XX., read in 1302 in a synod of Limoges, and which rebuked those who had erased the name of St. Martial from the list of apostles. It is also shown by Pope St. Innocent III., who, in an *Extravagans*: On Extreme Unction, makes mention of the miracle performed by St. Martial during his Gallic mission, in raising a man from the dead by the touch of St. Peter's crozier (4). In the ancient Martyrology of Corbie, we read under the date of the day before the calends of July: "Of St. Martial, bishop, who, having been ordained at Rome by the Blessed Apostles, was sent as first bishop of Limoges, where, illustrious for many virtues, he rested in peace." Similar evidences

(1) On the Epist. to Tim., c. 4.

(2) Writers.

(3) This *Martyrology* of Usuard, a French monk, was compiled by order of Charles the Bald (823-877), and was the one ordinarily used at Rome before that of Sixtus V. The *Martyrology* of Ado was made up from the Lesser Roman, itself drawn from the Great Roman of St. Jerome, and that of Bede, as augmented by Florus a subdeacon of the church of Lyons. Ado compiled it after his return from Rome, in 858. It served as a basis for the *Martyrology* of Notker, a Swiss monk of the monastery of St. Gall, issued in 894.

(4) It is in remembrance of this event that to this day, the Pope alone, of all bishops, carries no crozier; St. Peter having sent his to St. Martial.

can be adduced for the mission of St. Paul of Narbonne (1).

That the first bishop of Paris was a St. Denis seems to be certain, but the ancient and once almost universally received theory that this saint was no other than the Areopagite philosopher, is now rejected by the best critics. In the beginning of the ninth century, Hilduin, abbot of St. Denis, offered to the emperor Louis the Pious some writings on this subject, in which he cited some *Acts* of St. Denis composed by Visbius, a presumed eye-witness of the martyr's passion. In these *Acts*, it was recorded that Denis, the Areopagite, having been converted by St. Paul, was sent by Pope St. Clement into Gaul, that he founded the see of Paris, and was there martyred. Mosheim and others accuse Hilduin of having forged these *Acts* in the interest of the celebrity of his monastery. This allegation is contradicted by the reputation the abbot enjoyed among his contemporaries (2), and by the centuries during which many of the learned gave credence to the *Acts*. But although Hilduin did not wish to deceive others, he was himself deceived, as we shall see, by a similarity of name, which caused him to confound two different personages. Those who identify the Areopagite, with St. Denis of Paris base their assertion, secondly, upon the ancient *Life of St. Genevieve* (3), written, says its author, eighteen years after the virgin's death (512). Here we also read that St. Denis was sent to Gaul by Pope St. Clement, and, triumphantly asks Alexandre (4), "Who else can that be, than the Areopagite?" A third argument is found in a Hymn in honor of St. Denis by Fortunatus of Poitiers, which tells us that "he was sent to Gaul by Clement of Rome, to sow the seed of the word." Passing some other arguments of minor importance (5) which are adduced to show the identity of the Areopagite and the bishop of Paris, we come to one upon which Alexandre greatly relies.

(1) *Martyrology of Rossvegd*. USUARD: Day before the Ides of December. ADO: *Feasts of the Apostles*, 11th of calends of April.

(2) Lupus, abbot of Ferrières *epist.* 1101 styles Hilduin "conspicuous for his nobility, dignity, and moderation: a master of ecclesiastics."

(3) This *Life* is found in Surius, Jan. 3rd, and in the MSS. codices of St. Remigius of Rheims, formerly preserved in the monastery of Compiègne.

(4) *Cent. I., dissert.* XVI., *prop.* II.

(5) Eugenius of Toledo (c. 650) distinctly says that the Areopagite went to Gaul. Simeon Metaphrastes, who lived during the reign of Heraclius, asserts the same. Pope Stephen III., having been cured by the intercession of St. Denis while in France, erected a monastery in Rome, which he assigned to some Greek monks.

St. Methodius, patriarch of Constantinople and martyr, in the year 818, came to Rome as an imperial legate, and brought with him a *Life of St. Denis the Areopagite*, in which we read: "Then this Blessed Denis, ploughing the sea with the cross, came from Athens to Rome, led on the way by the divine will, as one beloved by God. Having entered the city, and found the Blessed Clement, who occupied the Apostolic Chair, he was received with such honor as circumstances allowed. St. Antonine being sent into the regions of Aquitaine, he himself, with Sts. Lucian, Rusticus, and Eleutherius, proceeded to the city of Paris. . . . St. Denis himself remained in Paris." Anastasius the Librarian tells us that Methodius drew his materials for this book from many old Greek writings.

The testimony of St. Methodius would certainly be of great value, if there were not good reasons for supposing that he did not write his *Life of St. Denis* before he came to Rome in 818; that hence he derived his opinions from Hilduin, who published his book about the year 834. In this chronological question lies the difficulty we experience in accepting the authority of St. Methodius. Anastasius certainly says that he brought the book to Rome, and that he derived it from old Greek sources. Nevertheless, we agree with Roncaglia (1), that St. Methodius derived from Hilduin the theory of the identity of the bishops of Athens and Paris. Hilduin says that "the Greeks have written nothing about the death of Denis the Areopagite, because, on account of the distance, they knew nothing about it." But if St. Methodius had already, sixteen years before Hilduin wrote, published his theory, and one founded, too, "upon old Greek writings," the abbot of St. Denis, a learned and well-informed man, would not have made this assertion. And Hincmar, in an Epistle to Charles the Bald, tells us that he had read the work of St. Methodius, and found it conformable to what he had learned in his childhood about St. Denis, "which information the Greeks had derived from the Romans." We therefore deem it more than probable that the argument derived from St. Methodius should be

(1) *Animadversion III.*, on Alexandre's *Diss. XVI.*, cent. I., prop. II.

regarded as of no more weight than the one drawn from the *Acts* presented by Hilduin to Louis the Pious. What value that possesses, we now proceed to examine.

From Hilduin to Alexandre, with very few exceptions, those who hold that the Areopagite was the first bishop of Paris, base their argument merely upon the constant tradition that Pope St. Clement sent a certain St. Denis to Gaul. They conclude that this personage must have been the Areopagite, simply because he was still living during the Pontificate of St. Clement. None of the ancient writers assert that our St. Denis the Areopagite was made bishop of Paris, or even went into Gaul. On the contrary, the old *Martyrologies* make an explicit distinction between the two saints, the one of Athens, and the other of Paris. Adrian Valois says: "After Sirmond, Launoy treats this question, adducing all the ancient MSS. *Martyrologies* of the French church, in which each Denis is located in the month of October, but on separate days; in which they are distinguished, one from the other, by different sees, and different kinds of death; in which one (the elder, and the Athenian) is called bishop of Athens, and is said to have there perished by fire, while the other (that is, ours) is styled bishop of Paris, and declared to have been beheaded near the city. All the Gauls, all the Franks, in fine all Christians, down to the ninth century, that is, to the time of Louis the Pious, son of Charlemagne, always distinguished, as I do, two Denises. Then the legates of the Constantinopolitan emperor, often coming into France, and understanding that the first bishop and martyr of Paris was called Denis, they brought forth the writings (as was pretended) of Denis the Areopagite; and persuaded Hilduin, abbot of St. Denis, that this author was the bishop of Paris and the patron of that monastery. Most willingly believing this, he composed a book of Areopagitics, full of fables, to persuade people that our first bishop and martyr was also the Athenian Areopagite. So much availed vanity, wishing to claim an Apostolic origin for our first bishops, preferring a fable and an imposture to solid and incontestable truth" (1). And in another place: "I must give you the

(1) In Papebrock, in Answer to exhibition of errors, &c., *art.* 11, § 4, *epist.* 1

words of Usuard, a grave, erudite, and exact author, who did not wish to follow his contemporary Hilduin, but, in the *Martyrology* dedicated to Charles the Bald, made a sacrifice to truth, first, by writing under date of the Fifth of October: 'Fifth of the Nones of October. At Athens, the natal day of St. Denis, who, after a brilliant confession of faith, and most terrible torments, was crowned with a most glorious martyrdom,' as attests Aristides of Athens, a man of great faith and wisdom, in his work on the *Christian Religion*. Behold Denis of Athens, or the Areopagite. Then follows the other under date of the Ninth of October, thus: 'Sixth of the Ides of October. In Paris, the natal day of the holy martyrs, the bishop Denis, the priest Rusticus, and the deacon Eleutherius. The said blessed bishop, directed by the Roman Pontiff to preach the Gospel in Gaul, came to the aforesaid city, where for some years he fulfilled his allotted task, and at length, being seized by the prefect Fescenninus, completed, together with his companions, his martyrdom by the sword" (1). The learned Bollandist, Sollier, commenting on the text of Usuard, under date of Oct. 9, when is recalled the memory of St. Denis of Paris, has the following: "Restricted within the limits of the *Martyrologies*, we shall only allege such reasons as can be defended by their authority. Behold the words of Jeromian of Corbie: 'At Paris, the natal day of Sts. Denis, bishop; Rusticus, priest; and Eleutherius, deacon.' Bede agrees with this: 'At Paris, the natal day of the holy Martyrs, the bishop Denis, Rusticus, and Eleutherius.' You have also the *Lesser Roman*: 'At Paris, the bishop Denis with his companions, punished with the sword by Fescenninus.' The same is the opinion of Ado. . . . . Now compare these with the words under date of Oct. 3d, related by the *Lesser Roman*, Ado, Usuard, and Notker, and you will clearly see that in their mind the Denis of this day is very different from the Areopagite. The Denis, whose feast is this day celebrated, is called bishop of Paris, as to whose century, country, mission, companions, and deeds, there have been many controversies, especially during the last century." Pagi observes

(1) *Idem*, *epist.* 2.

that Hilduin did not succeed in convincing the minds of the Martyrologists of his own Benedictine order, who were really or nearly his contemporaries. Thus, as we have seen, Ado, Usuard, and Notker are plainly averse to his theory. Alexandre uses the testimony of John Scotus Erigena, who, however, militates rather against his theory, for, in the cited passage of his letter to Charles the Bald, he clearly says that only the more recent writers assign the Gallic mission to the Areopagite (1). Alexandre endeavors to elude the force of the argument taken from the *Martyrologies* by asserting that it merely proves that St. Denis, at different periods, occupied the episcopal chairs of Athens and Paris; that in the Greek *Menology*, we find the names of Sts. Eustathius and Alexander in two different places for a like reason. But in all such cases, says Roncaglia, the *Martyrology* obviates danger of error by noting the place of death; and in the case of St. Denis, wherever the Areopagite is clearly mentioned, Athens is the place assigned. Again, nearly all the ancient *Martyrologies*, when speaking of the St. Denis of Oct. 3d, call him the Areopagite; they never so style the St. Denis of the 9th. Sirmond (2) says of the opinion of the Holy See on this point: "What Roman Pontiff ever thought of styling Denis of Paris the Areopagite, or of saying that the Areopagite ever filled an episcopal chair other than that of Athens? Stephen III., it is said, was cured of a disease by Denis of Paris. Who denies it? Grateful for the favor, the same Pontiff decreed a temple in Rome in his honor, and it being built, Paul, brother of Stephen, and his successor, dedicated it. But what then? Did either Stephen or Paul call this Denis the Areopagite? . . . . . Let the partisans of St. Denis (the Abbey of) open their archives, and examine the Diplomas of the Pontiffs, all that they have, from Zachary down to Innocent III.; they will never read otherwise than of St. Denis Martyr, of the Monastery of St. Denis Martyr, of the Abbots of St. Denis Martyr. Let them turn to the Roman archives, and

(1) Erigena rejects the theory only on account of its newness, and Pagi ascribes this to his wish not to contradict Hincmar, who favored Hilduin's idea, and had much influence with king Charles, to whom Erigena was writing.

(2) *Dissertation on the Two Denises*, c. 6.

what we have lately observed of the Greek writers, they will find in Martin, Agatho, Adrian, viz., that whenever they cite the words of Denis the Areopagite, they always designate him as bishop of Athens, never of Paris, which they would have done, had he migrated from Athens to Paris."

Alexandre urges against the argument, derived from the constant naming of the Areopagite as bishop of Athens, certain instances to prove that not always, in ecclesiastical history, does a translated bishop derive his title from his new see. It is the general rule, however; and of all the instances cited by the great Dominican, there is but one which Pagi does not refute. Thus, in the case of Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was made bishop of Constantinople after Alexander, and who continued to be called bishop of Nicomedia (1), this designation was his only legal one, for he had usurped the chair of Paul, and after his death, Paul was restored. The second instance cited by Alexandre is of Theodore of Perinthium, who, being at first bishop of Heraclea in Thrace, was made, under Valens, patriarch of Antioch, succeeding Euzoius, and was styled, nevertheless, *Heracleotes* (2). But this example proves nothing, since Philostorgius (3) tells us that Dorotheus, not Theodore, succeeded Euzoius at Antioch. Alexandre also adduces the instance of St. Gregory of Nazianzen, who was transferred from the coadjutorship to his father, in that city, to the see of Constantinople, but was always called Nazianzen. This argument is certainly unworthy of Alexandre, for he could not have forgotten, even though Homer sometimes sleeps, that St. Gregory, for love of peace, soon resigned the see of Constantinople, returned to Nazianzen, and there ruled until his death. There remains the case of St. Methodius, who was transferred from Patara in Lycia to Tyre, but continued to be called bishop of Patara (4). To this instance Pagi well observes that Leontius, who alone styles Methodius bishop of Patara, does not destroy the force of a rule, nor does one exception much injure its application. Again, Methodius was better known as bishop of Patara, for, while in that see, he wrote

(1) PHILOSTORGIUS : *b.* 2, c. 17.  
(2) THEODORET : *b.* 2, c. 3.

(3) *Ibid.*, *b.* 9, c. 14.  
(4) LEONTIUS ; *Sects.*, act. 3.

his books. Before we leave this topic of episcopal translation, we may remark, with Sirmond, Pagi, and Roneaglia, that, if St. Denis the Areopagite had been transferred from Athens to Paris, it is strange that such translation has never been cited by those olden writers who have defended the occasional usefulness of such procedure. Other instances they have gladly mentioned, but in regard to this early example they have been silent (1). We shall conclude our reflections on this subject by remarking that both the *Acts* of St. Denis of Paris, and the *Life of St. Genevieve*, cited by Alexandre, assert that St. Denis was ordained by St. Clement and sent into Gaul. Now if he was ordained by St. Clement, he was not the Areopagite, for the *Apostolic Constitutions* (2) and the Latin and Greek *Martyrologies* inform us that the latter was ordained by St. Paul.

By the middle of the fourth century, Christianity had conquered the south and east of Gaul, but in the far north and in the west, St. Martin (316-400) found Paganism yet flourishing. In the year 314, a Council of Western bishops was held at Arles, but we do not know how many Gallic prelates were present. At the Council of Nice, in 325, only one Gallic bishop is recorded as subscribing. Arianism did not make much progress in Gaul, although Constantius, its protector, caused a second council of Arles, in 353, to condemn St. Athanasius. Thanks principally to the learning and courage of St. Hilary of Poitiers, the faith of Nice stood firm; only Saturnine of Arles, among the bishops, remained obstinate, and the synods of Beziers, in 356, and of Paris, in 360, suspended all communion with the Arians. In 384, the heresy of the Priscillianists, which made some progress in Spain, was condemned by a synod at Bordeaux. But in the beginning of the fifth century, the Goths and Vandals, infected with Arianism, burst into Gaul, and the churches and clergy suffered much at their hands. The Franks, however, under the glorious rule of their kings, remained faithful to the Church, and when the storm passed, religion continued to develop.

(1) Auxilius, in his book to Leo of Nola, defending Pope Formosus because he had left the see of Porto for that of Rome, cites many instances, but says nothing of St. Denis. In the ninth century, Popes Adrian II. *ap.ist.* 57 and Stephen VI. *ap.ist.* 1 both justify the translation of bishops by early precedents, but are silent in the matter of St. Denis.

(2) *Book* 7, c. 46.

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SECRET.

From the fact that in the very early days of the Christian Church there seems to have prevailed a deep silence in regard to certain doctrines, Protestant writers contend that such teachings were unknown to our ancestors in the faith. While this silence is by no means so profound as our opponents declare it to be, and while so purely negative an argument would not be very weakening to the Catholic system, yet it behooves the student to examine the bearings of the adverse position, and to form a judgment as to its strength. When this is done, it will be found that out of that very silence, from which much is hoped, there comes a voice proclaiming, in no dubious accents, the antiquity of the doctrines in question. It will be seen that the first Christian pastors enjoined upon the faithful the observance of a certain *Disciplina Arcani*, or Discipline of the Secret, according to which the knowledge of certain doctrines was jealously withheld, not only from Pagans and Jews, but even from the postulants preparing for baptism. So convincing are the proofs of the existence of some such rule on the part of the early Christians, that Protestant historians (1) readily admit them, but endeavor to attenuate their influence by assigning the introduction of the discipline to the end of the second century, and by confining its objects to the inhibition of certain rites to the Jews and Pagans. Matthew Pfaff, also a Protestant, agrees with Catholic authors in asserting that the rule in question was established in the days of the Apostles, and that it prohibited not only a participation in certain ceremonies, but even the very knowledge of certain dogmas. (2)

St. Basil the Great, in his book on the Holy Ghost, chap. 27, speaking of the Secret, says: "The Apostles and fathers,

(1) Cassaubon, Basnage, Tentzel, Le Clerc. (2) *Last diss. on theological prejudices*, § 13.

who in the beginning arranged ecclesiastical affairs, in silence and in secrecy preserved the dignity of the mysteries. For that is not a mystery which is wafted to the imprudent and popular ear." The testimony of St. Basil is certainly of great weight with one who wishes to form an idea of the opinions of that day, and he lived from 328 to 379. But Tertullian, who goes further back, (150-230) tells us of the heretics of his time, (1) "I must not omit a description of the heretical customs; how futile, how earthly, how human they are; without gravity, without authority, without discipline; in fine, fitting to their faith. Firstly, it is uncertain who is a catechumen and who a believer. Alike they approach, alike they hear, alike they pray. Even when the Pagans come in, the holy things and pearls, albeit false ones, are flung to the dogs." Scarcely a century had passed since the Apostles made their regulations, when these words were written, and here we find accused of acting without authority and discipline, those who presumed to manifest certain doctrines to the Gentiles. Had such a custom not been antagonistic to primitive law, even the impetuous Tertullian would scarcely have made such an ebullition. But in his *Apology*, chap. 7, this father affords us perhaps a better argument. The Pagans had charged the Christians with secretly celebrating the Thyestean banquets. (2) Refuting the calumny, Tertullian brings forward the discipline of the Secret, declaring that even if the Christians were guilty of such atrocities, the crimes could not be discovered, as no strangers were admitted to the reunions, and the participants were prohibited to reveal any of the proceedings. He says: "If we always lie hidden, when was revealed what we perform? And by whom could it be revealed? Not by the guilty parties, for silence is imposed in regard to all the mysteries . . . If they have not betrayed themselves, then the revelation came from strangers. But whence did the strangers receive the information, when reverent efforts always keep the profane at a distance?" According to Tertullian, therefore, the secret discipline was

(1) *Præscript.*, chap. 41.

(2) Thyestes, son of Pelops and brother of Atreus, committed adultery with the latter's wife, and to revenge himself, Atreus caused him to eat the flesh of his own son.

in full vigor, not only in his time, but had come down from the days of Tiberius—Apostolic times.

An objection against the existence of the Secret, regarded as a concealment of certain doctrines, is adduced from the command of Christ to preach the new Gospel from the house-tops. But nothing can be found in this command which can militate either for or against the system. As the context shows, our Lord wished to show that in matters of faith the injunctions and threats of men were to be of no weight in the scale of our duty. He immediately adds that we should not fear those who can kill the body, but cannot kill the soul. And we read in *Matth.*, c. 7, that we should not throw holy things to dogs, nor pearls to swine. Both commands were admirably reconciled by the Church when on the one hand she sent her martyrs to painful death, and on the other, in her Secret Discipline, she kept the unbaptized in ignorance of certain doctrines which as yet they "could not bear."

The *Apology* of St. Justin is sometimes adduced to show that, in the time of that father, the secret system was not yet in vogue. This document was presented by the martyr to Antoninus Pius, who reigned 138–161, and in it we find a plain, though succinct, account of the doctrines of Baptism and the Eucharist, and also a narrative of the doings of the Christians in their hidden assemblies. It is strange, we are told, that St. Justin would so violate an important law of the Church. But from the contents of this *Apology* we must logically conclude neither that there was a disobedience on the part of St. Justin, nor that, as is urged, the law did not exist. The Church has always varied her discipline according to the adjuncts of time, place, and circumstances; now mitigating it, now rendering it more severe, in order that, without a sacrifice of essentials, she might be all things to all men. The circumstances of the Christians in the days of St. Justin were peculiar. Fearful rumors of Christian wickedness were rampant; it was even believed that in their secret meetings, new-born infants were slain, their blood imbibed, and their flesh devoured. It became necessary then that some responsible person should be

permitted, nay, probably enjoined, to inform the Pagan world as to what was promulgated and what done in those mysterious conclaves about which gossip so wildly raved. Hence St. Justin addressed the emperor and the senate, informing them especially of the nature of the Eucharistic sacrifices, between which and the fearful rites of the Thyestean banquets there was no real analogy. And the very fact of the spread of this terrible accusation conclusively proves that the real nature of the Eucharistic mystery must have been hitherto carefully hidden from the Gentiles, or, in other words, it shows the preceding existence of the Secret Discipline.

Let us now approach the subject matter of the system. Protestant critics generally hold that it embraced merely certain rites of worship, and not certain heads of doctrine. As has been already hinted, the elucidation of this point is of importance, since Protestants found an argument against the antiquity of some Catholic teachings, upon the silence thereon of the fathers. Now Origen (185-254) alludes to this silence, and gives a reason for it. His antagonist Celsus, having designated Christian doctrine as *clancularia*, he presses him as follows, "Since he often calls our doctrine a secret one, he must be refuted, for our teachings are better known to the entire world, than are the whims of the philosophers. Who knows not that Jesus was born of the Virgin, affixed to the cross, and risen from the dead; that there is to come a judgment by which the unjust will be visited with merited suffering and punishment? Is not the mystery of the resurrection on the tongue of the infidels, so that their ignorance is ridiculous? Certainly, then, he is silly who calls our doctrine a hidden one. *Of course there are certain more recondite teachings, not manifested to all*, and this method is common to Christianity and philosophy, for this latter has some things acroamatic and some things exoteric (1). To some of the disciples of Pythagoras, it was more than sufficient to hear that he had "so said." Anything stronger than the above can scarcely be desired for the defence of our position,

(1) The doctrines openly taught were called Exoteric; those manifested to a favored few, were styled acroamatic or Esoteric.

but it may be well to enter a little into detail, and see whether the olden writers allude by name to any of the acroamatic doctrines. The most sublime of all Christian dogmas is that of the Unity and Trinity in God. Facing an idolatrous world with the fundamental teaching that there is but one God, the Church felt it to be more prudent to withhold the companion doctrine of a Trinity of Persons from her catechumens until their minds had been prepared by grace and discipline to properly, albeit inadequately, understand it. When this time arrived, that is, a few days before the reception of baptism, the appointed catechist unfolded the tremendous article of divine faith. In his sixth *Catechism*, no. 29, St. Cyril of Jerusalem plainly shows us both the fact and the economy of the Church in this matter. Addressing the candidate, he says: "To thee who art come forth from the ranks of catechumens, the Church now manifests these mysteries which it is not the custom to lay open to the Gentiles; for we do not show the infidel what pertains to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, nor even to the catechumens do we speak openly about the mysteries; and this in order that the informed faithful may understand, and the uninformed may not be injured." St. Cyril was born in the year 315, and it may be alleged that such testimony does not affect the Protestant assertion that the concealment of certain dogmas was introduced only towards the close of the second century. But the holy bishop expressly states the reasons of such concealment, and they are such as to apply slightly indeed to the circumstances of his time, but with overwhelming force to the adjuncts of the primitive Church. St. Cyril wrote at a time when Christianity was comparatively triumphant, while Paganism was relegated to the nooks of the empire. People were better instructed as to truth than they were in the days when a monument was erected in Portugal, thanking Nero "for having purged the province of robbers and of those who were teaching the human race a new superstition." A Tacitus could not at that time accuse the followers of the Lamb of God of cherishing an insatiable hatred against humanity (1),

(1) *Annals*, b. 15, c. 44.

nor would a Suetonius have numbered among the meritorious works of a sovereign, the persecution of Christians as a superstitious and malefic sect" (1). There was then comparatively little reason for a continuance of the Secret Discipline in the time of St. Cyril, and it was probably kept in force because of the conservative instincts of the Church which render her slow to change without necessity, and because of the deep impression produced upon her catechumens by the practised reticence. We must in conclusion suppose that, if the system was carried out when there was no apparent necessity for it, it was obligatory when both moral and physical circumstances would have prompted its adoption. The saintly and eloquent prelate of Milan, Ambrose, (340—397) tells us, in his twentieth epistle, to his sister, that he was accustomed to dismiss the catechumens, and to then explain the Creed to the competent.

As for a reticence in regard to the Eucharistic doctrine, we find an argument for it in an epistle of Pope St. Julius I., who was elected in 337. In his letter to the Eusebians, he gravely rebukes them for having spoken of the Blessed Sacrament in the presence of Jews and Pagans. His words are: "Before the prefect and his followers, and in the presence of Jews and Pagans, a question was put, concerning the chalice and the table. This would have been incredible, had it not been proved by documents. That which caused us to wonder, will, I think, produce the same effect upon you: that a question upon the Body and Blood of Christ. . . before an outside judge (2), in the presence of catechumens, and what was more unworthy, before Pagans and Jews. . . was held."

St. Augustine tells us (3), that in his day, if catechumens were asked if they were fed with the Body of Christ and if they drank His Blood, they would not know what was meant by the question; which certainly shows that at that time the doctrine of the Real Presence was limited to the baptized, for whatever interpretation Protestants may give to that doctrine, they must admit that when the holy bishop of Hippo uses the phrase above given, he alludes to the Holy

(1) *Life of Nero*, c. 16.(2) "*Externum*."(3) *Tract 11th on John*, No. 3.

Communion, understood in some way or another. Thus speaks St. Augustine : "If we ask a catechumen, 'Dost thou believe in Christ?' he will answer 'I believe,' and will sign himself. Now he carries on his forehead the cross of his Lord, and is not ashamed of it—behold he believes in His name. If then we ask him, 'Dost thou eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and dost thou drink His Blood?' he knows not what we say, for Jesus has not given Himself to him."

Before demonstrating the usefulness of the Discipline of the Secret, we must remark that the existence of this system does not at all weaken the argument for the divinity of Christianity, which is drawn from the difficulties attending its propagation. One of the greatest of these difficulties is formed by the dogmas of the Trinity and the Eucharist—the one so imperative in its demands upon faith, and in its apparent contradictions of sense; and the other so apparently antagonistic to the fundamental idea of Divine Unity, and so incomprehensible in its presentation of the personal relations in the Divinity. It may seem that if these great obstacles to conversion were removed from sight, there would be nothing so wonderful in the quick propagation of the faith, as to necessitate the supposition of a divine intervention as a means of accounting for it. But we must remember that these doctrines were kept hidden only for a time, and then, with their presentation to the neophyte, the difficulties in question would arise. And there were other doctrines and duties which were inculcated at once, and which of themselves were well calculated to give birth to difficulty. Such were the necessity of curbing the depraved instincts of unbridled passion, and the many logical consequences of such restraint. Then, above all, there was the law of divine charity, with its manifold permeations through the chain of human obligations; and to this law, unless enlightened and strengthened by divine grace, no self-sufficient Pagan would have bent his stubborn neck.

And now for the usefulness of the Secret Discipline. But little need be said on this point, as from the preceding remarks sufficient may be gathered to show that the Church displayed no puerility in the premises. As for the

charges of inhumanity, we fail to see how the most extravagant hyper-criticism can discover any foundation for it. And where was the silliness in preparing a weak mind for the reception of difficult truth? Is the physician silly who, though he knows his patient to be in need of nourishment, causes him to abstain from the more solid food until his stomach is in a condition to bear it? St. Cyril of Jerusalem (1) illustrates the economy of the Church in these words, "When the instruction is delivered, if a catechumen asks you what the teachers have been saying, answer him not, for we have taught thee a mystery and the hope of the world to come. Keep the secret for Him who will give the reward. Let no one perchance say to thee, 'what harm will there be if I also learn?' Sick persons often ask for wine, and if it is unseasonably given them, it produces frenzy. Then two evils arise—the patient dies, and the physician is blamed. So it happens if a catechumen learns a mystery from a believer; for the catechumen suffers from frenzy. He understands not what he hears, disparages the whole matter, and receives it with sneers; at the same time the believer is condemned as a traitor." St. Augustine (2) assigns another motive for this treatment of postulants. The Church, he supposes, wished to inflame their zeal of knowledge, to excite them to a desire of receiving baptism, by presenting to them that sacrament as a portal, through which alone they could pass into the coveted regions of mystery.

And now we approach the real centre of interest excited by the ancient Discipline of the Secret. Protestant critics would scarcely have tried to disprove its existence, and that failing, to discredit its Apostolic origin, had they not discovered in it a most convincing proof of the antiquity of the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. And certainly the Eucharistic theories of Calvin, Zwingle, &c., could but produce little impression upon men who saw, in the history of the first Christian centuries, undoubted evidence that their ancestors in the faith believed the Blessed Sacrament to be precisely that which it was held to be by the obedient children of Leo X.; namely, truly and in-

(1) *Pro-cat.*, No. 12.(2) *Treat* 96 on John.

deed the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, present therein, not in any figurative or spiritual manner, but in reality, and by a Transubstantiation of the elements. Besides the testimonies we have adduced to show the care exercised by the Church of the first centuries in shielding the dignity of the mysteries, not only from any approach of Jews and Pagans, but even of her own postulants, we might fortify our position by quotations from Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, the author of the *Recognitions* attributed to Pope St. Clement, and many others, but enough has been brought forth to convince a candid mind that the diligence displayed would have had no reason of existence had the early Christians regarded the consecrated elements as being still in substance mere bread and wine. On the contrary, in the supposition that the Catholic position is correct, we at once perceive a reasonableness in the *Arcanum*. The mystery was sublime, to a degree beyond any conception of the human imagination; the minds of the catechumens were as yet "of the earth, earthy" and comparatively imbecile as to the things of God; well might the Church refuse to lift the veil of the Secret until the weak candidate had made progress in humility, and until he had become convinced of the truth of divine revelation; well might she prefer to first familiarize the postulant with the prodigies performed by Christ and His saints, ere she demanded from him the prostration of his intellect, and the abdication of his senses in so recondite and tremendous a dogma. But why should she consult the imbecility of the human mind, why respect so assiduously the dignity of the mysteries, if Christ were only figuratively present, if that dignity were such as arose only from bread and wine? Had the Eucharistic teaching of the Church been of so easy an interpretation as the Protestant theory would imply, then indeed the drawing over it a mystic veil would have been silly and puerile. Nay, when we reflect upon the terrible calumnies which the Pagans put forth as to the cannibalistic practices of the Christians in their secret assemblies, we must say that it would have been the imperative duty of the Church to lift a curtain, for which there was no necessity.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE EASTER CONTROVERSY.

In the second century of the Christian era, there was a great difference among the churches, as to the time for the celebration of Easter. Those of Asia Minor, following, they said, the instructions of St. John the Evangelist and St. Philip, celebrated the Pasch, as did the Jews, on the fourteenth day of the March moon; while the other churches, following that of Rome, and relying upon the authority of Sts. Peter and Paul, postponed the celebration until the following Sunday. Imitating the example of our Lord, the Asiatics ate the paschal lamb on the evening of the fourteenth day; some of them then terminated the lenten fast, others observed it for two days more. As with us now, so then, the Resurrection was celebrated by the Asiatics on the third day after the paschal meal; hence, when the fourteenth day fell at any other time than Thursday, the feast of the Resurrection could not be kept on the proper day, Sunday. But outside of Asia Minor, the paschal lamb was not eaten until the night of Saturday, and the Easter was always kept on a Sunday (1). This diversity of rite caused no little scandal, and might well be regarded by the infidels as indicative of a kind of schism. It certainly appeared strange that one church should be buried in grief and wrapped in mourning, while another was filled with joy. And this diversity bore its fruit through the entire ecclesiastical year, for upon the date of Easter depended the dates of all the movable feasts. It is not strange, then, that there arose a controversy, which owing to the unwillingness of Rome to enforce her discipline, where faith was not concerned, and where greater evils were to be apprehended, was not ended until the time of the Coun-

(1) When it is said that the Asiatics kept the Pasch on the fourteenth of the March moon, it is not meant that on that day they celebrated the Resurrection, but that then they ate the paschal lamb. This has been proved by the erudite Jesuit, DANIEL, in an apposite dissertation, and by MOSHEIM, *Hist.*, 2d cent., § 71.

cil of Nice ; indeed, among the Britons and Scots, the seventh century had closed before the Roman discipline was thoroughly adopted. The dispute commenced about the year 160, when St. Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, came to Rome and consulted with Pope Anicetus on the matter. Eusebius tells us (1) that, "while Anicetus governed the Roman church, Irenaeus commemorates that Polycarp, who was yet alive, came to Rome, and had a colloquy with Anicetus about the controversy as to what day the Pasch should be celebrated." But the Pontiff could not prevail upon Polycarp to give up what was already an old custom. However, as we learn from St. Irenaeus (2), "they parted in peace, and all the churches, those who kept the Pasch on the fourteenth day, and those who did not, continued to enjoy tranquillity among themselves." But about the year 194, in the Pontificate of Victor, the dispute became more vivid. The Montanists were asserting (and with them a Roman priest, named Blastus) that Christians are obliged, by divine law, to celebrate the Pasch with the Jews, and the Pontiff feared that any further delay in settling the controversy would result in the Asiatics becoming infected with this error. Accordingly he ordered the metropolitans, throughout the Church, to hold synods in their respective provinces, to consult as to the Paschal discipline, and to report to the Holy See their conclusions. Among the letters which came to Rome in answer to the Pontifical command, were some from the bishops of Palestine, declaring that the Asiatic abuse was now entrenching upon matters of faith. This made Pope Victor the more determined, and he wrote to Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, commanding him to convoke a synod of all the bishops of Asia Minor, and communicate to them the Pontifical resolve to excommunicate all who would continue to keep the Pasch on the fourteenth day. Eusebius (3) tells us the result. "For this reason are collected the bishops in synods and assemblies ; and all are of one mind, issuing ecclesiastical decrees to all the churches, to the effect that the Resurrection of the Lord be celebrated

(1) *History*, i., 4, c. 13.

(2) *Epist. to Pope Victor*, in EUSEBIUS, b. 5, c. 24.

(3) *History*, b. 5, c. 23.

only on Sunday. We have even now the rescript of those who met for this reason in Palestine, over whom presided Theophilus of Caesarea, and Narcissus, bishop of Jerusalem. At Rome also a synod was held under the presidency of Victor. And another, of the bishops of Pontus, under the venerable Palma. Also, one of the dioceses of Gaul, which Irenaeus governed. And another, of the prelates of Isrlhona, and the cities therein; especially one of Branchillus, bishop of Corinth. And all of these issue the same decree. However, over the bishops of Asia Minor, who declared that they must cling to the custom handed down to them of old, presided Polycrates, who, in a letter sent to Victor and the Roman Church, explains the tradition observed down to his time, in these words: 'We celebrate the Paschal day inviolate; great luminaries have died in Asia—Philip, one of the twelve Apostles, and John, who reclined on the breast of the Lord, Polycarp, &c.—these all observed the day of Pasch on the fourteenth day of the month, according to the Gospel, preserving the rule of faith in everything.'" The bishops of Asia Minor gained their point, for, as we shall see, Pope Victor did not carry out his threat of excommunication. The affair remained as a bone of contention, though it never culminated into anything like schism, until the year 325, when the first general Council of Nice decided that throughout the world, the feast of Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday following the fourteenth moon, after the vernal equinox. The Britons and Scots, from the year 566, for about a century, labored under an error in this matter which was peculiar to themselves, and of which we shall speak at the close of the chapter.

Concerning the action of Pope Victor in this Paschal controversy, there are several points to be elucidated. Learned men have differed as to whether Pope Victor really excommunicated the Asiatics. Protestants have asserted that he did fulminate his censure. but that the prelates laughed at it; the best of Catholic critics generally hold that the Pontiff was content with a threat; that such was the sense of the phrase used by Eusebius, "he *tried* to cut them off from the community of the Church (1)." Mosheim

(1) *Ibid.*, b. 5, c. 24.

(1), Potter (2), and Le Clerc (3) agree in holding that at that time the Roman Pontiff had no jurisdiction over Asia, and that the action of Victor was one of the first instances of Papal attempts at usurpation. The limits of our work do not permit of any extended defence of Pope Victor, nor, indeed, does his conduct, so far as history presents it, need any patronage. We shall merely observe that he did not act merely upon his own impulse ; long before he proceeded against the Asiatics, he took the opinions of the bishops of Palestine, Pontus, Mesopotamia, Corinth, and Gaul ; when he finally did act, he spoke at the head of a Roman synod. Neither St. Irenaeus nor Polycrates accuse the Pontiff of arrogating to himself any undue authority, and one great proof that his action was justifiable, is found in its confirmation by the Council of Nice. St. Irenaeus certainly “decently admonished” Victor, as Eusebius has it, lest he should cut off from communion so many bishops, but he agreed as to the Paschal decree. Polycrates certainly resisted the Pontiff ; and there have ever been, are, and ever will be, men to do likewise ; but that is no argument against the legitimacy of the Papal authority. We now proceed to the solution of various questions arising from the Paschal controversy.

Did this controversy regard a matter of faith, or one of discipline ? We must reply that it was a dispute as to a mere disciplinary matter, although, at the time that Pope Victor took his decisive stand, the question bade fair to yet encroach upon the domain of faith. Certainly there was in the Church a difference of opinion, and a difference of practice, as to the Paschal time, and that variety had been expressly tolerated by the Holy See. In matters of faith, however, there can be no room for doubt, no scope for variety. Therefore, Pope Victor, Irenaeus, Polycrates, and all those connected with the controversy, must have looked upon it as one of discipline. Had it been regarded by St. Irenaeus as a question of faith, he would not have deterred the Pontiff from anathematizing the recusants. Nor

(1) *Christianity before Constantine*, 2d cent., § 72.

(2) *Spirit of the Church*, v. 2.

(3) *History*, years 194 and 196.

can it be urged that the rebellious in this matter were afterwards condemned as heretics, and styled *Quatuordecimani*, or "devotees of the fourteenth," and that as such they are numbered among heretics by Sts. Epiphanius and Augustine, and by Theodoret. They were not condemned as heretics before the Council of Nice, and then it was because they were reviving, so far as in them lay, the Mosaic Law, by joining its observances to the Gospel; they were not condemned as heretics, merely because they kept the Pasch on the fourteenth day of the March moon. The Church looked upon them as heretics because, as St. Epiphanius says (1), "They taught certain things which are not consonant with her institutions and doctrine, for they clung to Jewish fables." Before the Council of Nice, one could apply to the Asiatics of this question the words which St. Augustine afterwards applied to the Donatists, in the matter of rebaptizing heretics (2), "The obscurity of this opinion forced great men, and bishops endowed with great charity, so to contend among themselves, communion unbroken, that for a long time synods established a diversity of statutes in their respective regions, until at last a General Council, removing all doubt, decided what was, with safety, to be held."

Now we come to the question whether Pope Victor reduced to action his threat to excommunicate the reculant prelates of Asia Minor. We cannot arrive at certainty in this matter, but the probabilities would seem to demand a negative response. Eusebius (3) says, "Influenced by these things, Victor, who then governed the Roman Church, *tried to cut off* from the common unity of the Church all the churches of Asia and other neighboring ones, as being of another faith and opinion, and inveighed strongly against them by letter; and he decreed that all the brethren inhabiting that region should be entirely excluded from communion." We gather from these words that the mind of the Pontiff was resolved upon a future excommunication, but from the next words of the historian it seems plain that the

(1) *Heresies*, 50.(2) *On Baptism, against the Donatists*, b. 7, c. 7.(3) *History*, b. 5, c. 24.

sentence was never pronounced. "But this did not please the other bishops. They therefore earnestly exhorted him to the contrary, that he might keep a diligent care for peace, charity, and concord with his neighbors. Their words, sharply and bitterly reproaching Victor, are yet extant. Among them, Irenaeus, though he wrote in the name of the Gallic brethren whom he governed, declaring indeed that the feast of the Lord's Resurrection should be kept only on Sunday, nevertheless admonished Victor not to cut off from the body of the Church of Christ so many churches because of an observance of an ancient tradition received among them." It is not probable that St. Irenaeus would have so spoken, had the anathema been already proclaimed. Eusebius gives a fragment of the letter of Irenaeus (1), in which the saint quotes the course pursued by the predecessors of Victor, and it is quite probable that the Pontiff concluded to follow in the path they had marked out. It is objected that as Pope Victor excommunicated the Roman priest Blastus for celebrating the Pasch on the fourteenth day, so it is not probable that he made an exception in favor of the Asiatics. But it should be noted that Blastus was bound to follow the discipline of his diocese; by abandoning it, he subjected himself to censure. Again, Blastus was not anathematized because of his opinion as to the date of the Pasch, but on account of his conjunction of Mosaicism with Christianity (2), and because he had become a Valentinian (3). There is a passage in the works of St. Epiphanius (4), in which it is asserted that the Eastern and Western Churches were so divided on this question, as to cease from any pacific interchange of letters, but this would only indicate a bitter feeling, not necessarily a rupture of communion. Sozomenus was well acquainted with the writings of St. Epiphanius, and yet he tells us (5), "I think that the controversy on this matter was most wisely settled by Victor, then bishop of Rome, and by Polycarp of Smyrna. For when the priests of the West deemed that the tradition of Peter and Paul was not to be contemned, and the Asiatics declared

(1) *Ibid.*, c. 25.

(2) See the *Supplement to Tertullian's Prescriptions*, c. 53.

(3) THEODORET, *Fables*, b. 1, c. 23.

(4) *Heresies*, 70.

(5) *History*, b. 7, c. 19.

that they followed John, a common decree was sanctioned, whereby, each one celebrating the feast (as they had been accustomed to do), they did not dissolve the mutual communion. For they considered it frivolous, and rightly, to segregate, for the sake of a custom, those who agreed on the principal points of religion." With regard to this question of Pope Victor's excommunication of the Asiatics, several erudite writers, men of excellent judgment in matters of criticism, have held that the sentence was pronounced (1). Their chief arguments are as follows: First, they insist upon the positive language of Eusebius, and hold that it implies far more than a mere threat upon the part of the Pontiff. One passage of the historian is certainly very favorable to their theory (2). "Having sent letters to all the brethren who were there (Asia), he proscribed them, and pronounced them entirely foreign from the unity of the Church." As for the intercession of St. Irenaeus, that occurred, say some, between the utterance of the threat and the fulfilment of the sentence; it is believed by Tillemont to have been made after the promulgation of the excommunication, and to have been a prayer for its abrogation. These authors rely considerably on the testimony of the historian Socrates (3), which is strong in their favor. When they are told that this writer's testimony is of dubious value in the premises, since, as a Novatian, it was his interest to depreciate Pope Victor, and since, also, whenever he is actuated by party spirit, he is an unmitigated liar (4), they answer that Socrates is not unsupported. Baronio and Scheelestrate hold that Pope Victor excommunicated the Asiatics because they contended that the Pasch should necessarily be celebrated on the fourteenth day; to

(1) SCHEELESTRATE: *Antiquities of the Church*, p. 2, PAGI; on Baronio, year 196. TILLEMONT: vol. 3. MASSUET, *Dissert. præf. on St. Irenaeus*. RONCAGLIA, note to Alexandre's *Dissert.* V. in 2nd Cent.

(2) *History*, b. 5, c. 24.

(3) *History*, b. 5 c. 21.

(4) The following instances of mendacity on the part of Socrates are noted by Alexandre. In the cited chapter, he asserts that the Roman Church observes only three weeks of Lent, while his contemporary, Pope St. Leo, is a witness (*Sermon 4, on Lent*) to the fact that throughout the West, the full Lenten fast was respected. In the same place he says that Rome allowed the Lenten fast to be suspended on Saturday, just as on Sundays, while we know that the fast was unbroken, from Augustine's *Epistle to Casulanus*, 86. In his book 6, chap. 3, he says that St. John Chrysostom "was given rather to anger, than to observance," that in his conversations he was "insolent," and that he was justly deposed "because he had deprived the Novatians and Quartodecimans of their churches."

this Roncaglia sensibly replies that if they had gone so far, no Catholic would have communicated with them, even before the sentence of the Pontiff; no Irenaeus would have interceded for them, and certainly the Pope would not have restored them to communion.

The Gallican school, now happily relegated to the realms of history, was fond of citing this controversy on the Pasch as furnishing an argument against Papal infallibility. Had the Christians of those days believed in the inerrability of the Pontifical teachings, neither the Asiatics nor St. Irenaeus, it said, would have acted as they did. But, as we have seen, throughout the whole dispute between Victor and the Asiatics, there was not for a moment a question of faith. And had the bishops of Asia Minor resisted the Pontiff because they thought that he erred in a matter of faith, they must also have denied the infallibility of the Universal Church, for it is certain that, with the exception of themselves, the whole Church held that the Pasch should be celebrated on the Sunday following the fourteenth day of the March moon.

The Council of Nice finally put an end to this famous dispute. In the Synodical Epistle to the church of Alexandria (1), the fathers say, "As for our unanimous consent as to the celebration of the Paschal Feast, know that through your prayers the controversy, held on that matter, has been prudently and conveniently settled; so that all the brethren who live in the East, and who hitherto have been used to imitate the custom of the Jews in the observance of that Feast, will hereafter follow, with consenting minds as to its celebration, us Romans, and all of you, who have from the earliest times clung to our method of keeping it." In the Epistle sent by the emperor Constantine to all the churches, he gives the following reasons why the fathers of Nice issued the decree (2): "It seemed unworthy that we should celebrate that most holy festival with a copy of the Jewish rites and customs (copying those, that is), who are properly held in the blind error of their souls because they polluted their hands with a horrible wickedness. . . . there are

(1) THEODORET; *History*, b. 1, c. 2.

(2) *Ibid.*, c. 10.

those who celebrate a second Pasch in the same year. And why should we imitate those, who are certainly afflicted with the malady of error? Those who celebrated the Pasch on the fourteenth moon, caring nothing for the equinox, sometimes did so after the equinox, sometimes before it, because the fourteenth moon rose at that time. And it is a great shame that there should reign dissension in regard to so solemn a feast of our religion; it is indecorous that on the same day some should be fasting, and some banqueting; that after the Pasch, some should be fasting because of the remission of their sins, and others be yet in the prescribed fasts. . . . . I myself thought that your Wisdom would easily assent, that what is unanimously observed in the city of Rome, in Italy, in all Africa, in Egypt, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Libya, throughout Greece, in the Asiatic diocese, in Pontus and Cilicia, should be willingly observed by you. . . . Since things are so, accept this decree as a gift of God, and a command truly sent down from Heaven; for whatever is agreed upon in the holy Councils of the bishops, must be attributed to the Divine Will." The reader will observe that Constantine here places Britain among the countries which followed the Roman tradition as to the celebration of Easter. This fact is worthy of note, as the Centuriators of Magdeburg, and other Protestant critics, have asserted that Britain received her first Christian instruction, not from Rome, but from the East. Constantine was born and bred in Britain (1), and probably knew of what he was talking. Had the Britons received their religion from the East, it is improbable that they would have held the Roman discipline as to the Pasch. This remark brings us to a very interesting phase of the Paschal controversy, namely, that which was presented by the British Isles, when, for more than a century, they followed a custom, in this matter, peculiar to themselves.

We would draw the reader's attention to the following remarks of the erudite Dr. Moran, now archbishop of Sydney (2): "Some reader, unacquainted with the records of

(1) BEDE: *Eccles. Hist. of the Angles*, b. 1, c. 8.

(2) *Origin, Doctrines, and Discipline of the Early Irish Church*, c. 1

Ireland in her first ages of faith, may be surprised at seeing *Scotia* marked by St. Prosper as the field of Palladius' apostolate. However, in the fifth century Ireland was the only country known by the name of *Scotia*. This was at one time a matter of angry discussion; but at length all controversy has ceased. The researches of the Scottish antiquaries themselves, and their open acknowledgment of the fallacy of the opinion which referred that name to modern Scotland, have set this question at rest for ever. We shall, therefore, on this head, merely remark with Dr. Todd, that 'Whoever reads the works of Bede and Adamnan, will not need to be informed that, even in their times, *Scotia* meant no country but Ireland, and *Scots* no people but the inhabitants of Ireland' "(1).

The Scots, or, to use the more modern name, the Irish, received the Christian faith at the hands of St. Patrick in the year 432. The Britons may have received some knowledge of the faith before the second century, but positive evidence can be adduced for such reception only in the Pontificate of Pope Eleutherius in 182. The British church was driven to the mountains of Wales by the Saxon conquest in 454; the conversion of the Saxons was commenced in 596, and consummated in about eighty years. The Christians of Britain and *Scotia* were preserved by their isolated position from the heresies which agitated the East, and with the exception of a short inroad from Pelagianism, they preserved the purity of the faith. But the Paschal controversy was destined to cause trouble in both countries. At the Council of Nice it had been determined that, since the date of Easter depended on astronomical observations, and the Egyptians excelled in such, the patriarch of Alexandria should annually communicate to the Roman See the proper time, to be made known to the distant churches. But again disputes arose, for the Roman and Alexandrian methods of computation were different; the cycle of Rome contained eighty-four years, that of Alexandria nineteen. About the middle of the sixth century, the

(1) The first author to apply the name *Scotia* to Scotland was Marianus Scotus, who died in 1086. The olden name was *Alba*, also *Caledonia*. The first Scotch settlement in *Caledonia* was made from "Greater" *Scotia*, or *Hibernia*, in 503.

Holy See adopted a new cycle of ninety-five years, or five Egyptian cycles. But the Britons and Scots, almost cut off from communication with Rome, continued the ancient manner of calculation. Originally, then, there was no difference between the Roman Church, on the one side, and the British and Scotch Christians on the other, with regard to the Easter question. We learn from Comm. de Rossi's work on *Roman Inscriptions*, that at the Council of Arles (314), where the cycle of eighty-four years was adopted for the computation of the Paschal time, there were British bishops present, and "it requires little sagacity to perceive that these prelates received their cycle, and the manner of computing Easter, from Pope Sylvester, and the corrections and changes which were subsequently made did not reach them, as they were so much separated from the continent of Europe as to be considered at the end of the earth. . . . Hence, we understand the origin of the famous controversies about the manner of keeping Easter in the British Churches; thus the fable of the Eastern origin of these churches, and of their peculiar Paschal rite, is exploded, and the union of the ancient British church with that of Rome is proved by a new argument." In the year 630, the bishops of Munster and Leinster celebrated a synod at Magh-lene to promote a settlement of the controversy. One of its most distinguished members was St. Cummian. He was deeply attached to the old traditions, and fully appreciated the fact that the Irish Easter method had been derived from St. Patrick. We shall allow him to speak his own sentiments, for they serve to confute those who hold that the early Irish were not united with Rome. "'An old authority,' says Jerome, 'rises up against me. In the meantime, I cry out, whosoever is joined to the chair of St. Peter, that man is mine.' What more? I turn to the words of the bishop of Rome, Pope Gregory, gifted with the appellation of the Golden Mouth, who, though he wrote after all, is deservedly preferred before all; and I find him thus writing on this passage of Job—Gold hath a place where it is melted, etc. 'The gold is the great body of the saints; the place of melting is the unity of the Church; the

fire the sufferings of martyrdom; he, therefore, who is tried by fire, and is outside of the Church, may be melted, but cannot be cleansed.' What can be deemed more injurious to Mother Church than to say, Rome errs, Jerusalem errs, Alexandria errs, Antioch errs, the whole world is in error; only the Scots and Britons know what is right? . . . Having, therefore, studied the matter for a year, I asked my fathers to declare to me, my elders to tell me (the successors, forsooth, of our first holy fathers, bishop Ailbe, Kieran of Clonmacnoise, Brendan, Nesson, Lugid) what they thought of our being separated from the above-mentioned Apostolic sees. And having met all together in the plain of Magh-lene, some in person, some by legates sent in their stead, they decreed that 'our predecessors, through meet witnesses, of whom some are yet living, while others sleep in peace, commanded us to humbly receive, without hesitation, whatever things were better and more estimable, whensoever they were approved of by the source of our baptism and wisdom, and brought to us from the successors of the Apostles of the Lord.' Afterwards they, of one accord, set forth to us, according to custom, a mandate upon this matter, to keep Easter, the coming year, in unison with the whole Church" (1). In accordance with the decree mentioned by St. Cumminian, legates were sent to Rome. They returned in 633 with the news that their Easter method was wrong. In the following year, a letter arrived from Pope Honorius. Ven. Bede tells us (2), "Pope Honorius sent letters to the Irish people, whom he found to err in the calculation of the Easter time, and he exhorted them not to regard their own small population, dwelling at the extreme end of the inhabited earth, as wiser than the churches of Christ, both ancient and modern, throughout the world; and not to persist in keeping a Pasch different from their Pasch, and opposed by the Easter computations and synodical decrees of the bishops of the entire world." This letter was read in the synod of Lethglin in 635, and it settled forever the Paschal controversy in the south of Ire-

(1) *Letter to Seigiennus, Abbot of Hy.* See also *Irish Glosses by STOKES.*

(2) *History, b. 2, c. 19.*

land. In the north, however, the old state of affairs lasted some time longer. The archbishop of Armagh wrote to Pope Severinus in 640, but the letter arrived after that Pontiff's death. The Roman clergy replied, censuring the Quartodecimans, but as the Irish protested their rite was simply the ancient rite of Rome, and that they also opposed the Quartodecimans, they believed themselves justified in holding on their course. As Dr. Moran says (1), "The Roman Church was subsequently too much distracted by other cares, and we find no decision on record regarding the Paschal controversy which was agitated in our island."

The merit of putting an end to this dispute among the Saxons belongs to King Oswin. Among the many Irish monasteries celebrated, during the sixth and seventh centuries, as centres of learning, none were more distinguished than those of Hy and Lindisfarne. From them the Britons, Saxons, and Picts, drew treasures of religion and literature. St. Aidan, the founder of Lindisfarne, converted the Northumbrians, and became archbishop of North England. His second successor was Colman, who had been a monk of Hy, and was sent from there, according to Bede, to instruct the Angles. For a long time after the conversion of the Northumbrians, the Irish missionaries were all-powerful with prince and people; but when King Oswin married Eanfled, who had been educated in Kent, under Roman teachers, the Paschal difference drew his attention (2). To procure uniformity, he invited the two contending parties, in 664, to meet him at Whitby, and there dispute the question. The champion of the Roman computation was St. Wilfrid, at this time abbot of Ripon. He had been educated at Lindisfarne, but had acquired in Rome the new computation. Associated with Wilfrid was Agilbert, a Frenchman, who had studied in Ireland, and was then bishop of the West Saxons. The defence of the Irish cause was entrusted to St. Colman, and in his argument, he did not censure those who used the Roman cycle, but claimed the right to retain a custom founded by so many holy men. To this St. Wilfrid replied, "I believe that had they been

(1) *Loc. cit.*, p. 158.

(2) LINGARD: *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, c. 1.

rightly informed on the subject, they, too, would have conformed to the universal usage. You and your associates certainly commit sin if, after hearing the decrees of the Apostolic See, nay, of the Universal Church, and these confirmed by the holy Scriptures, you disdain to follow them. For although your fathers were saints, yet in their small number, in the very extremity of the world, they must not be preferred to the whole Church. And however holy and illustrious a performer of miracles your Columba was, is he to be preferred to the most blessed Prince of the Apostles?" The end of the discussion was that Oswin declared he would "not oppose the heavenly gate-keeper," so Wilfrid's side gained the day. We will dismiss this subject with the following quotation from Dr. Moran's valuable work (1): "One happy result, at least, followed from the conference at Whitby, that, forsooth, it preserved an indubious record of how the Irish and Roman clergy, even in the warmth of their controversy, were found of one accord asserting the prerogatives and supreme authority of St. Peter. St. Wilfrid and Agilbert were themselves, indeed, witnesses as to the teaching of the Irish schools, whilst Colman combined in himself the doctrine of Lindisfarne and Iona, nay more, of the whole Irish Church; for, on being expelled from his monastery by King Oswin, he retired to Ireland and founded there the monasteries of Inisbofin and Mayo, being venerated by all for his learning and sancity. The learned Protestant dean of Ardagh (2), to whose singular opinions we have more than once referred in the preceding pages, thus comments on the Whitby conference:—Colman, when he found his opinions rejected, resigned his see of Lindisfarne, rather than submit to this decision of the king, thus furnishing us with a remarkable proof that the Irish bishops in the seventh century rejected the authority of the Pope. This, indeed, is singularly strange reasoning. His logical conclusions should rather have been—1. That as there was no exercise of the Pope's authority, St. Colman could not

(1) P. 3, c. 1.

(2) Dr. R. Murray. The book alluded to by Dr. Moran is entitled *Ireland and her Church*, London, 1845.

have resisted it. 2. That he even openly and expressly acknowledged the authority of Rome. 3. That he moreover furnishes us with a most striking proof of the opinion of the Irish church in the seventh century, that the judgment of the court or crown was very far from being decisive on matters of ecclesiastical discipline; and hence—4. That St. Colman would deem it strange, indeed, to be classed by the worthy dean amongst the members or abettors of the Anglican church.” (1)

(1) Speaking of this difference of discipline prevalent, at one time, in the Roman and British churches, Lingard says: “On this circumstance the prejudice of party has endeavored to build a wild and extravagant system. Because the British Christians of the seventh century differed from the Roman Church in the time of celebrating Easter, it has been gratuitously asserted that they were Quartodecimans; that of consequence their fathers were of the same persuasion; and ultimately that the faith was planted in Britain by missionaries who were not sent from Rome, but from some of the Asiatic churches. The truth or falsehood of the latter hypothesis is of little consequence; yet it is certain that the Britons, in the time of St. Augustine, were not Quartodecimans, as they observed Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, only when that day happened to be a Sunday; (Bede, b. III., c. 4) and that their ancestors were not Quartodecimans, is no less certain, if any credit be due to Eusebius (*Hist.*, b. 5, c. 23), to Socrates (b. 5, c. 21), to Constantine, in his letter to the bishops (Euseb., b. 3, c. 14) and to the subscriptions of the British prelates to the Council of Arles (*Spel. Conc.*, p. 40). I should not omit that Goodall (*Introduct.* to *Hist. Scot.*, Keith’s *Catal. of Scottish Bishops*, preface) asserts that the Scots employed the same cycle, and observed Easter on the same day as was customary in the Roman Church, previous to the Council of Nice. He founds his opinion on the ancient Paschal Table published by Bucher, in which the festival is fixed on the fourteenth day of the moon for the years 316 and 320.” *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, c. I.

“It is quite commonly believed that there is a law prohibiting Christians from celebrating the pasch on the same day with the Jews, and its existence is asserted in various works. But no such law exists, and it was never enforced. Pope Victor simply decreed that the pasch should not be celebrated, as is done by the Jews, on any day whatever of the week, but only on a Sunday. In fact, in the year following that of the Council of Nice, that is, 326, the Christian pasch coincided with that of the Jews, and it was so celebrated without any difficulty being raised. The same coincidence occurred in 1602, 1609, 1805, 1825, and in the next century, it will happen in 1903, 1923, 1954, 1981. In these years the pasch falls on a Sunday, and precisely on a day of full-moon. Therefore it is an error to suppose, as some do, that when the moon becomes full on a Sunday, the pasch is to be postponed to the following Sunday. On the contrary, the Council of Nice declares that, in such a case, the Sunday is especially opportune for the solemnity. And indeed, a postponement would carry the pasch to the 22nd day of the moon, that is, into its last quarter, which would be a direct contradiction of the will of the Council. . . . It would certainly be an improvement if Easter were made an immovable feast, and the Church ‘exercising her right, could freely do so’ (*Explanation of the Roman Calendar, as restored by Pope Gregory XIII.*, by Christopher Clavius, Rome, 1603). But the Church has preferred to retain the present system, both because of its antiquity—a great obstacle to any innovation—and because of ‘the recondite mysteries included in it.’” *CANTU; Univ. Hist., Documents: art. Chronology*, § 25.

## CHAPTER IX.

### CONTROVERSY REGARDING "THE FALLEN" UNDER PERSECUTION.

The constancy which our ancestors in the faith, generally speaking, exhibited under persecution, is so remarkable, that we rightly look upon it as one of the many proofs of the divinity of our holy religion. Their constancy was so different from the perseverance sometimes shown by the votaries of other creeds in similar circumstances, so void of obstinacy, petulancy, fanaticism, or fatalism, that the rationalist tries in vain to account for it on purely natural grounds. But there were some exceptions to this rule of constancy, in all of the persecutions, just as there was one in the very first assemblage of Christians that the world beheld. Especially, during the persecution of Decius, the number who denied their faith, directly or indirectly, was large. This persecution was far more ferocious, as we have seen, than any of the preceding ones, and it came upon the faithful with multiplied force, because they were comparatively enervated by a long period of rest. We have said that the number of the "fallen" was large in this persecution; we mean, not that a great many openly denied the One God, and sacrificed to the false deities of Paganism, but that many shrank from an open avowal, and availed themselves of an unworthy and cowardly scheme to escape from the consequences of unshaken fidelity. For the fallen must be divided into two classes, the "thurificators," or offerers of incense, and the *libellatici*, or those who took out pretended certificates of sacrifice. The name of the first class sufficiently indicates the status of its members, but an explanation is necessary to a full understanding of the meaning of the third term. Many of the magistrates, whom Decius ordered, under threat of condign punishment, to enforce his edict, were approachable by bribes; some also were of a clement disposition. Whether influenced by love of money or by sentiments of pity, these officers devised a

means of avoiding the commanded act of sacrifice, which proved acceptable to many of the weaker Christians. This means consisted in taking from the official a certificate (*libellus*), which stated that the bearer had offered sacrifice to the gods. And as it was not necessary for the recipient to appear in person before the judge, since he could receive the saving document through an agent, he the more easily satisfied his conscience that he had not even seemed to deny Christ before the world. Had such persons simply bribed the judges to leave them in peace, to abstain from citing them before the tribunals, they would merely have manifested a weakness; but in the case of the certified, in the Decian persecution, their fellow citizens were led to believe that they had denied their God. And even though the giving of false certificates were so common and notorious, that it would always be doubtful whether, in this or that particular instance, the denial had really been pronounced, yet the certificated person was subject to the imputation, and therefore gave reason for grave scandal to his brethren. Hence the Church regarded the certified as ranking in guilt next to the sacrificers. St. Cyprian says, in his fifteenth epistle to the clergy of Rome, "When I found those who had tainted their hands and mouths with sacrilegious contracts, or had polluted their consciences with the execrable certificates, going around among the martyrs and confessors, importuning them for intercessory letters, without any discrimination or examination of each case, I wrote to those martyrs and confessors, that, so far as in me lay, I might recall them to the observance of the Lord's precepts." In another place (1), the saint compares the weakness of the certified with the conduct of Eleazar, as narrated in *March. II., c. 6*. "And lest any one take advantage of the wicked offer of the deceivers, in the shape of a certificate, or any other deception, let Eleazar not be forgotten, who, when the royal ministers offered him food which he was allowed to eat, that he might deceive the king by appearing to eat the illicit food of sacrifice, would not consent to the fraud, saying that it was not fitting to his

(1) *Exhortation to Martyrdom, c. XI.*

age or station to feign what would scandalize others, and lead them into error. . . . . God, who is the judge of our consciences, and alone to be feared, cannot be mocked or deceived."

In the first quotation from St. Cyprian, we learn that the fallen used to beg from the martyrs intercessory letters, or petitions to the Church, that the bishops would shorten their public penance. The reverence of the faithful for those who had suffered, or were about to suffer, for the faith, was very great, and the Church encouraged that reverence, even to the point of granting to the prayers of the confessors what would otherwise never have been conceded. Hence, those who had unfortunately become either sacrificers or certificated, thronged around the expectant sufferers, beseeching them to request, through the Church's appreciation of their coming trial, a remission of the punishment due to their own pusillanimity. This custom was greatly abused, and many of the fallen insisted upon the bishops accepting the "letters of peace" in lieu of any public penance. "Some of these turbulent spirits," says St. Cyprian, "who, even in the past, were with difficulty ruled by us, and in our very presence were disputatious, now became, through these letters, as fiery as though a torch had been applied to them, and tried to extort the peace promised them" (1). And again, "After I had written to you about the temerity of certain persons who refused to perform penance and satisfy God, they applied to me, saying that peace was not *to be given* them, for it had *already* been given to them by Paul (a certain martyr)." This demand of the fallen was most presumptuous, and of itself proved that they were in bad disposition for communion, for the Church had always insisted upon satisfaction for sin. The Church had always striven against the abuse of the martyrs' letters of peace. From the most ancient times, the deacons were in the habit of visiting the prisons to moderate the zeal of the confessors in granting such letters. And it was always understood that the peace of the Church was not attained by the mere reception of such a letter; that

(1) *Letter to the Roman Clergy*, No. 15.

the martyrs merely besought the peace for the recipient, as a favor to themselves. Again, in granting the letter, the martyr was obliged to name the person in whose interest the favor was asked ; it was therefore an inexcusable abuse to extend the favor to one's friends, as many tried to do. St. Cyprian speaks of this attempt as follows (1) : " You ought to correct this thing diligently, and designate by name those to whom you wish peace to be conceded. For I hear that letters are given by some, saying, ' Let so and so communicate, and also his friends,' and hitherto that has never been done by the martyrs. . . . I therefore ask that you designate by name, and give letters, consonant to faith and discipline, only to those whom you yourselves see and know, and whose penance you know to be nearly completed."

This abuse of the letters of peace, and especially the claim that they were of themselves sufficient to entitle the recipient to communion, was resisted to the utmost by St. Cyprian, in whose jurisdiction most of the trouble happened. He was obliged to contend, not only against the audacity of the fallen, but even against many of the martyrs, who insisted upon the conciliatory nature of their letters as being independent of any episcopal decision. Thus, a practice which had come in vogue through the Church's veneration for those who had shed, or were about to shed, their blood for Christ, now threatened not only the right of the pastors to control their own discipline, but that humility and simplicity of motive which were, under God, the surest force of the martyr. In the midst of his anxiety, St. Cyprian be-thought himself of the Apostolic See, but the chair of Peter was then vacant, and so disturbed were the clergy of Rome by the fierceness of the persecution of Decius, that it was as yet impossible to fill the vacancy. However, the holy bishop of Carthage besought the advice of the Roman clergy, and the result was the issue of a provisory decree to the effect that the owners of letters of peace were to be reconciled to the Church, if they were in danger of death ; the others were to await the pleasure of their bishops, to be announced when the cessation of the persecution would

(1) *Epist. 2, to Martyrs and Confessors.*

admit of an examination of the respective cases. With regard to this decision, St. Cyprian wrote to Antonianus (1) "I wrote most fully to the Roman clergy, then without a bishop, and to the priest Maximus and other confessors then in prison, but now joined with Cornelius to the Church. What I wrote, you can know from their answers, for in their epistles they thus replied, 'What you have done in this important affair is pleasing to us, that the peace of the Church be first consulted; that then there be held a comparison of opinions, of the bishops, priests, deacons, and also the confessors, the laity being witnesses, to treat the cause of the fallen.' It was then added, that peace should be accorded to the fallen who were sick, or in danger of death. Novatian also subscribing to this, and reciting his subscription with his own voice; the priest Moses, then a confessor and now a martyr, also subscribing. These letters were sent through the entire world, and given to the knowledge of all the churches, and of all the brethren." The council which the Roman clergy recommended in their letter to St. Cyprian was held immediately after the death of Decius had given some peace to the Church, and a peremptory decree was issued, of which the saint thus speaks(2): "As had been already decided, when the cessation of persecution allowed us to meet, a large number of bishops came together, and the protection of the Lord and our own faith preserving us, the Scriptures were consulted by both sides, and we weighed the matter with saving moderation, that all hope of communion might not be denied to the fallen, and thus they be driven by desperation, if the Church were closed to them, to follow the world and live like gentiles. Nor should the ecclesiastical censure be disregarded, by our rashly admitting them to communion; so penance was continued, and paternal clemency was to be contritely sought after, and each case was to be examined, with the disposition and necessity of each person."

Finally, St. Cornelius having been elevated to the Papacy, a synod was held in Rome in the year 254, in which it was decreed that those of the fallen, who had really sacrificed

(1) *Epist.*, 52.(2) *Idem.*

to the gods, should do full penance before restoration to communion, unless they were in danger of death. Such of this class as were priests, were reduced to the rank of laymen, and as such, after penance, admitted to communion. The *libellatici*, or certificated, were received into the peace of the faithful without any penance, other than that they had themselves voluntarily undertaken. The Church was naturally much more lenient with the certificated than with the sacrificers. "There is a great difference," says St. Cyprian (1), "even among those who have sacrificed; what cruelty, then, what fearful acerbity, it would be, to join the merely certificated with the sacrificers! He, who has accepted the certificate, says, 'I had read, and I had known from the bishop, speaking on this matter, that I should not sacrifice to the idols, and that a servant of God should not adore at their altars; and therefore, when the occasion was offered to obtain a certificate, I went to the magistrate, or sent another—lest I might do that which is not permitted—and said that I was a Christian, that I could not sacrifice, that I could not approach the altar of the devil, and that therefore he should, in return for a sum of money, free me from doing what I was not allowed to do.' Now, however, this man, who is contaminated by his certificate, after he has understood from our rebukes that this thing should not have been done; that, even if his hands be pure, and his mouth tainted by no contact with forbidden food, yet his conscience is polluted; having heard all this, he stands and laments, &c."

If, at first sight, the Church's treatment of the sacrificers seems too harsh, it is well to know that, under certain circumstances, she tempered her severity. Thus, if a persecution were imminent, she conceded them immediate absolution. Under such circumstances, St. Cyprian wrote to Pope Cornelius, *epist.* 54, "Peace is now necessary, not to the weak, but to the strong; not for the dying, but for the healthy. We must now concede communion, that those, whom we exhort to battle, be not left helpless, but be fortified with the protection of the Body and Blood of Christ."

(1) *Epist. to Antonian*, 52.

Again, immediate absolution was granted to those of the fallen who suffered anything for the honor of Christ, or who did anything difficult which redounded to the good of the Church. This is proved by a letter of Caldonius, an African bishop, to St. Cyprian (1), asking his advice about restoring to communion some of the fallen ones who had just proved their sincere repentance by submitting to exile rather than to a denial of Christ. "You have judged correctly," answered the saint, "as to the granting of peace to our brethren, for they have brought it to themselves by true penance, and by a glorious avowal of the Lord." Further, if delay would have caused danger of schism, absolution was immediately granted to the fallen. This is shown by the rule laid down by St. Augustine (2): "I assert nothing new or unaccustomed, but what the health of the Church requires, that when any one of the Christian brethren, constituted in the society of the Church, is found guilty of such a sin, he be held worthy of anathema; let this be done where there is no danger of schism . . . . . He who diligently considers this, will not neglect the severity of discipline in the preservation of unity, nor will he rupture the tie of community by immoderate coercion." Finally, immediate absolution was conceded to the excommunicated, when any great good would thereby accrue to the Church, such as the extinction or diminution of a schism, or the conversion of many to the fold. We learn this from the action of Pope Cornelius in the case of several Novatian converts, and in the case of the priest Trophimus, who had wandered from the Church. In the first instance. Maximus, Urban, Sidon, Macarius, and several others, who had been deceived by the wiles of Novatian, begged to be restored to communion, and as the petitioners were leaders in the schism, the Pontiff hoped that their example would encourage the rank and file to return to unity. The priest Maximus was fully restored to his sacerdotal privileges; and full forgiveness, with no penance whatever, was accorded to the rest. The case of Trophimus is narrated by St. Cyprian in his 52nd epistle, to Antonian, and is of the same

(1) *Epistles of Cyprian*, No. 19.(2) *Against the Epistle of Parmenian*, b. 3, c. 2,

nature as the preceding, with the difference that Trophimus was reduced to lay communion.

In concluding this dissertation, we would observe that the enemies of Christianity do not seem to have perceived that the proceedings of the immense majority of the early apostates afford a good proof of the truth and sanctity of our religion. When the persecutions ceased, nearly all the "fallen" returned to their allegiance. And it is a remarkable fact that no one of these unfortunates, so far as we can gather from history, ever traduced the faith he had abandoned. Pliny declares, in his letter to Trajan, that he interrogated many of them, and was led to believe that Christianity was merely an excess of superstition.

---

## CHAPTER X.

### THE NOVATIAN HERESY.

The distinction of having been the first of the few Anti-Popes who have troubled the Church, belongs to Novatian, a Roman priest, born at the commencement of the third century. He had been a Pagan, and addicted to the Stoic philosophy, but being seized by sickness, he became a Christian. Baptized in his bed, he neglected to have the accustomed ceremonies supplied, and hence became irregular for the priesthood. His bishop, however, dispensed with the irregularity, and he received Holy Orders. When persecution became the order of the day, Novatian shut himself up in his house; his deacons endeavored to prevail upon him to go out and encourage the faithful, but he declared that he was tired of the priesthood, and would return to philosophy (1). This was the man who presumed to dispute the Papacy with St. Cornelius, after the election in the year 251. He had already sworn that he entertained no ambition for the Pontificate, but, scarcely had Cornelius been installed,

(1) *St. Cornelius, Epist. to Fabius of Antioch.*

when Novatian, by the connivance of three bishops (1), received episcopal consecration, and was proclaimed by a few partisans as head of the Church. His principal assistant, and probably the instigator of his schism, was Novatus (2), a Carthaginian priest, who, having revolted against St. Cyprian (3), had fled to Rome. He was, according to the testimony of the saint (4), "Always desirous of new things, furious with the insatiable rapacity of avarice, puffed up with arrogance and pride, always in bad odor with the bishops of these parts, condemned by the unanimous voice of the priests as a heretic; he was ever curious, that he might betray, and ever a flatterer, that he might deceive, but never faithful, that he might cherish. He was a torch for the starting of the fires of sedition, a whirlwind of tempest to make shipwreck of faith, an enemy of quiet, the adversary of tranquillity, the foe of peace. . . . The orphans whom he has defrauded, the widows whom he has robbed, the churches which he has despoiled, all demand his punishment. . . . His father died in the street, of starvation, and he would not bury the body. He kicked his wife in the abdomen, and through the miscarriage became a murderer. And now he dares to condemn the hands which sacrificed, when his feet are more guilty, since they killed his son." With the aid of this worthy coadjutor, Novatian soon secured a sufficient number of followers to cause a great amount of anxiety to the legitimate Pontiff. One of his first acts was to bind his partisans by oath never to return to the communion of Cornelius (5). He then sent legates to Carthage, bearing letters justifying his own usurpation, and calumniating St. Cornelius, but St. Cyprian refused to communicate with them. Through all Africa the faithful primate sent letters, exhorting all the bishops to remain true to the Papacy, "the root and matrix of the Catholic Church," and received answers confirming the "necessary origin and just reason" of the election of

(1) St. Cornelius says that they were "uncultivated and ignorant men, from the most insignificant and contemptible quarter in Italy." *Ibid.*

(2) St. Epiphanius, Eusebius, and Theodoret, confound the two men; Sts. Cornelius and Cyprian, and Pacian, clearly distinguish them.

(3) He accused the holy bishop of too great leniency in his treatment of those who fell, during persecution, and was destined himself to rush into the other extreme.

(4) *Epist.* 49, *to Cornelius*.

(5) Each one received the Holy Eucharist, and instead of replying "Amen" to the words of the communicator, said, "I shall never return to Cornelius."

Cornelius, and his "glorious innocence" (1). Novatian made great efforts to draw the confessors and expectant martyrs to his side, knowing well how much prestige would be gained by such success. Hearing of this attempt, and learning that it had not been entirely unsuccessful, St. Cyprian sent letters, to be first submitted to the Pontiff, exhorting the candidates for martyrdom to remain faithful to unity, and his zeal resulted in the return of many perverts. Novatian endeavored to win over Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, declaring to him that he had with great unwillingness accepted the Pontificate. Dionysius answered him thus: 'If you did this unwillingly, as you say, you will easily prove it, by renouncing the position. For one should suffer anything, rather than impair the concord of the Church of God. That martyrdom which is sustained for the sake of the unity of the Church, is not only not less commendable, but is even more so than that which one would undergo rather than sacrifice to idols. In this, one suffers for his own soul; in the other, for the whole Church.'

The Novatians were, in the beginning, schismatics, but like most separatists, they soon joined heresy to their other crimes. Their first error was the denial of the Church's power to forgive those who had sacrificed to the idols, or even those who had taken out "certificates." St. Cyprian says that while he was suffering great anxiety as to what course to pursue with regard to these penitents, "behold, there arises on the other side an enemy, the adversary of any paternal clemency, the heretic Novatian, who does not merely imitate the priests and levite of the Gospel by passing the wounded man, but even kills him, by taking away all hope of salvation" (2). Novatian went so far as to deny the power of the Church to forgive any sin committed after baptism, although, in after times, his followers so far tempered the doctrine as to acknowledge the Church's power over venial sin. So we learn from St. Ambrose (3) and St. Pacianus (4). Another error of the Novatians was the re-baptism of their converts. They also condemned second nuptials.

(1) *Epist.* 45, to Cornelius.  
(2) *On the Fallen*.

(3) *On Penance*, b. 1.  
(4) *Epist.* 3, to Sympronianus.

The legitimate Pontiff, St. Cornelius, held a Council at Rome in the year 253, in which Novatian and his followers were anathematized. They had already been condemned in synods held at Carthage in 251, and in Antioch in 252. How Novatian terminated his career, we do not know. His followers asserted that he died a martyr. After denying the truth of this boast, St. Pacian (1) says, "And even if Novatian did suffer, he received no crown for his agonies. And why not? Outside the peace of the Church, outside of unity, away from that mother to whom must pertain every one who is a martyr, hear the Apostle saying of him, 'Even though I deliver up my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.'" Though divided into numerous sects, the Novatians did not vanish in the East until the seventh century; in the West, not before the eighth.

With regard to the cruelty of the Novatians toward the "fallen," it may appear that they were not any more rigid than were some of the early synods held by the orthodox; that some of the canons of the Spanish council of Elvira (2) seem nearly as rigorous as the Novatian practice. But it must be remembered that the Church holds and ever has held, that she has received from her Divine Founder the power to forgive *all* sin; that in the council of Elvira and similar synods this power was always asserted, though, owing to circumstances, the bishops deemed it necessary to exact in certain cases a long and severe penance before the concession of absolution. We have already seen, when treating of the discipline in regard to the fallen, that there were several circumstances in which the Church held her rigor in abeyance. But Novatian, or his adherents, denied the power itself, just as do the heretics of modern times. Socrates tells us, in *b. 7, chap. 25*, that Asclapiades, a Novatian bishop, said to a patriarch of Constantinople, "We cannot communicate with great sinners, but leave to God alone the power of forgiving them." And Sts. Pacian and Augustine ascribe this doctrine to Novatian again and again.

(1) *Idem*, Epist. 2.

(2) Held at the commencement of the fourth century. The precise date is controverted but most probably it was just before the persecution of Maximian.

In the days of Novatian there was more at stake than the mere policy or duty of pardoning the unfortunate fallen; there had arisen a question as to the *power* of the Church to forgive all sin. In the interest of his own sect, Mosheim says that the Novatians should not be reproached for corrupting Christian doctrine, as their opinions did not much differ from those of their fellow Christians (1). How far this assertion is true, we have seen. It may be painful for a Protestant to hear one of his favorite opinions condemned by the Church of the third century, but nevertheless the fact remains. The following passage from the letter sent by St. Cyprian to Pope St. Cornelius, after the celebration of the Council of Carthage of 251, furnishes an excellent summary of the question at issue with the Novatians, and of the action of the African fathers thereupon. "We had already decreed, after mutual consultation, that those who had been overthrown by the adversary in the heat of persecution, or had so fallen as to stain themselves with illicit sacrifice, should, for a long time, perform full penance; or, if there were danger of weakness, that they should receive peace when threatened by death. For it was not right, nor did paternal devotion or divine clemency allow, that the Church should be closed to those who applied for admission; or that those who were contrite, and sought the aid of salutary hope, should be denied it, and sent out of the world without the communion and peace of the Lord; when He Himself, who gave the law, had permitted that what was bound on earth, should be bound in Heaven, and what was loosed on earth, should also be loosed in Heaven. For when we perceived that another period of persecution was approaching, and by frequent and constant signs we were shown that we should be armed and prepared for the fight offered by the enemy; that we should get ready the people entrusted to us by the divine mercy; that we should bring into the camp of the Lord every one of the soldiers of Christ who call for arms and cry for battle; we deemed ourselves compelled by necessity to concede peace to those who had not left the Church of God, and who had not ceased

(1) *Eccles. Hist.*, 3rd cent., p. 2, c. 5; *Hist. Christ.*, 3rd cent., in notes.

from the first day of their fall, to do penance and to lament and to beseech the Lord." And in his 52nd epistle to Antonianus, the holy primate says, "We do not anticipate the judgment of God, who will ratify what we have done, if He finds that their repentance was sincere and entire. If we were deceived by false appearances, He will correct the sentence which we have pronounced . . . . . Since we know that no one should be debarred from doing penance, and that, by the mercy of God, peace can be accorded by the priests, we must have regard for the groans of our penitents, and not refuse them their reward."

---

## CHAPTER XI.

### CONTROVERSY ON THE REPETITION OF BAPTISM.

We now approach one of the most important controversies ever developed in the Church—important not only on account of the sanctity and eminent position of the parties to the agitation, but because of the vital nature of the principle involved. At the commencement of the third century, an opinion began to be ventilated that the validity of Baptism depended upon the orthodoxy of the minister. Such an idea was a natural outgrowth from a state of society intensely hostile to schism or heresy, if the members listened rather to their prejudices than to the calmly logical and unerring voice of the proper magistracy. The first promulgator of this opinion seems to have been Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, who, in a synod of his suffragans, held in the year 215, declared, says St. Cyprian (1), that "He who comes from heretics, and has not been already baptized in the Church, but comes as a profane one and an entire stranger, is to be baptized, that he may become one of the sheep, for there is but one water in the Church for the making of sheep. . . . . We also have followed this doctrine, as

(1) *Epist.* 71, to *Quintus*.

religious, legitimate, salutary, and agreeing with that of the Catholic Church." The new doctrine soon spread into the East, and acquired zealous defenders in St. Dionysius of Alexandria and Firmilian of Caesarea in Cappadocia. But its principal support was found in St. Cyprian. In the year 256, a synod was held at Carthage, in which the doctrine was so plainly asserted, that the fathers would not deign to use the word "rebaptize," but substituted "baptize," for, says St. Cyprian (1), "they do not receive anything where there is nothing; but they come to us, with whom are grace and all truth, for grace and truth are one." In the same year, another synod was celebrated at Carthage, and 71 bishops signed the synodical letter sent to Pope Stephen, begging his confirmation of their decrees. The following passage of this letter is interesting: "Many things were transacted, but we thought to write to you, and to consult your Gravity and Wisdom principally upon a thing greatly affecting the sacerdotal authority, and the unity and dignity of the Catholic Church, derived from the providence of God; namely, that those should be baptized, who come to us and the one Church, after having been tainted by profane water among the heretical schismatics." When Pope Stephen had read this synodical epistle, he vehemently reprov'd the errors it contained. His letter has not come down to us, but it must have been very firm, and very pointed in its terms. to cause St. Cyprian to speak of it as follows (2): "Among other haughty, or not pertinent, or contradictory things which he unlearnedly and improvidently wrote, he said, 'If, therefore, any one comes to us from any heresy whatever, let there be no innovation beyond what has been handed down to us, namely, that hands be laid upon him in penance.'" Baronio, and some others, hold that Pope Stephen excommunicated St. Cyprian and his brother bishops for their persistency in this matter, but the probabilities are in favor of the opinion that no such decree was issued. We shall speak more fully on this point, when we come to treat the various questions arising out of the controversy. Whether St. Cyprian abandoned his error or not, we have no means of

(1) *Ibid.*(2) Epist. 74, to *Pompeius*.

ascertaining, but it is certain that, through the entire controversy, he and his friends regarded the question as one, not of faith, but of discipline.

There are several knotty points in this controversy upon the Repetition of Baptism, and it would be very convenient, if we could dismiss the whole question as a work of the imagination, as lacking any historical foundation. But though there would then be no necessity for grappling with some apparent and some real difficulties, truth will not allow us to imitate those authors who have seen fit to reject as unauthentic the documents bearing upon the controversy (1). It is asserted by these writers that we ought not to credit the testimony of Eusebius in this matter; that he invented the whole history in the interests of the Donatists; and that, again, the Donatists themselves interpolated many of the passages of Eusebius referring to it. As for Eusebius' working in the interests of Donatism, merely because he was an Arian, that is pure conjecture, and not a solid one; again, we know that he really condemned rebaptism, from his *book 7, c. 2, &c.* As for the Donatist interpolations, we cannot acknowledge them, unless we are prepared to admit that a comparatively weak sect succeeded, in the face of powerful opponents, in vitiating all the codices of Eusebius' history. St. Augustine appears to speak very clearly upon all matters concerning the controversy, but his testimony is rejected by those who relegate the story to the realms of imagination. They contend that the holy doctor only speaks hypothetically of the matter, that is, that he supposes, merely for the sake of argument, that this history, adduced by the Donatists, is true, wishing to present to them (who were so rebellious) the picture of Cyprian, who differed in opinion from the head of the Church, but yet did not rush into schism. This theory is specious, but whenever St. Augustine treats of this subject, he seems to feel that it is a fact, one which, for Cyprian's sake, he would like to excuse. And in his *book 7, on Baptism, c. 20*, he says that "Peter, the first of the Apostles, might have thought otherwise than truth demand-

(1) Among these the best is John Alberi, of the Pious Schools, professor in the university of Pesth, who published, in 1820, a fine work on *Select Topics of Church History*.

ed ; which happened to Cyprian, as all of us, who love him, believe, without any reproach to him." Those who banish this controversy from the domain of history hold that the quality of authenticity is wanting in many of the documents upon which we rely to prove its reality ; for instance, in the epistles of St. Cyprian to the bishops of Numidia, to Quintus, to Jubajan, to Pompeius, and to Magnus ; in the *Acts* of the 3rd Council of Carthage, and in the epistle of Firmilian to Cyprian. The works of St. Augustine are full of passages which show that he regarded the cited letters of Cyprian as authentic, nor do they at all support the supposition of hypothesis alleged by the disbelievers in the controversy. The following, taken from his work *on Baptism*, b. 1, c. 18, would alone sufficiently show his mind : "Great proofs are extant in the letters of the blessed martyr . . . for in those days it appeared to him, and to nearly eighty of his bishops of the African Church, that a man who had been baptized outside the communion of the Catholic Church, ought to be again baptized on his return to the Church." As for the celebration of the 3rd synod of Carthage, the friends of the imagination theory would find it difficult to prove that such synod was not held. In addition to the testimony of St. Augustine just quoted, we have, in the *3rd book on Baptism*, "I would never believe that in a holy synod of his colleagues, Cyprian would utter with his mouth what he did not feel in his heart," and the context shows he speaks of the 3rd synod. And St. Jerome, speaking of Dionysius of Alexandria, says (1), "Consenting to the teaching of Cyprian and the African synod, he sent many letters to various persons in regard to the rebaptism of heretics." As for the authenticity of Firmilian's letter to St. Cyprian, only negative arguments can be adduced against it, and for it we have the positive evidence of Eusebius, Dionysius of Alexandria, and St. Basil the Great (2).

The first question arising from the controversy on rebaptism is about the threat of excommunication said to have been made by Pope Stephen against St. Cyprian.

(1) *Ecclesiastical Writers*.

(2) For a full defence of the authenticity of all these documents, consult PALMA ; *Lectures*, vol. 1, c. 28.

Was such a threat really made, and if so, was it put into execution? The saint insinuates, at least, that the threat was uttered, when, in his 74th letter, to Pompeius, he asks concerning Stephen, "Does he give honor to God, who communicates with the baptism of Marcion? Does he give honor to God, who asserts that remission of sin is given, among those who blaspheme God? Does he give honor to God, who declares that sons can be born to God outside, from an adulterous and fornicating one? Does he give honor to God, who, not regarding the unity and truth derived from divine law, defends heresy against the Church? Does he give honor to God, who, a friend to heretics, and an enemy of Christians, declares that the priests of God, who defend the truth of Christ and the unity of the Church, *should be shunned?*" St. Dionysius of Alexandria (1) says that Pope Stephen wrote a letter "concerning Helenus, Firmilian, and all the bishops of Cilicia, Cappadocia, Galatia, and the neighboring countries; saying that, for that reason, he would not wish to communicate with them. 'For,' said he, 'they rebaptize heretics.'" And St. Augustine speaks more strongly (2): "When, therefore, Stephen not only did not rebaptize heretics, but even thought that they should be excommunicated, who did so or allowed it to be done; nevertheless, Cyprian remained with him in the peace of unity." These authors certainly say that Pope Stephen threatened the rebaptizers with severance from the communion of the Church, but there is good reason for concluding that such a decree was not issued. The last clause of St. Augustine's testimony, just quoted, is explicit. Again, an excommunication of the rebaptizers by Pope Stephen would have furnished Augustine with a fine argument against the Donatists, but in none of his writings against them, do we find a hint of such a thing. On the contrary, in the book on Baptism which he wrote against those sectaries, we find, *b. 5, c. 25*, "Stephen had thought that they should be avoided who tried to destroy the ancient manner of receiving heretics. However, moved by the difficulty of the question, and being largely gifted with the bowels

(1) *Epist. to Sixtus, in Eusebius, b. 7, c. 5.*

(2) *On One Baptism, against Petilian, 14*

of charity, he decided to remain in unity with those who thought differently. . . . the peace of Christ conquered in their hearts, so that the evil of schism did not arise between them." St. Cyprian himself, in his letter to Jubajan, declares that he has always been in peace with his colleagues, and this would not be true, had he been excommunicated by the Pontiff. Those who believe that St. Cyprian and his fellows were really excommunicated, rely greatly upon a passage of Firmilian, in which he says to Cyprian, "In many other provinces, there is great diversity of opinion, and yet on this account, the peace and unity of the Catholic Church were not broken. Stephen has now dared to do this, breaking that peace with you, which his predecessors always preserved with you in love and mutual honor." But these and similar words, with which the letter of Firmilian abounds, do not necessarily imply an issue of a formal decree; they might well refer to a mere threat, especially when we consider that they were used by an angry man. "It is natural to angry men," says Alexandre, in treating of this objection, "to speak or write of their real or fancied injuries as far greater than they really are. Hence the tragic poet sang, 'The angry man utters only monstrosities.'" The whole tenor of Firmilian's epistle is one of impotent rage and disappointment; he does not hesitate to compare the Pontiff to Judas, to accuse him of manifest foolishness, to charge him with designating St. Cyprian as a "pseudo-Christ," and an "unfaithful laborer." No matter how holy the former and after life of Firmilian may have been, in this letter he certainly abandoned the ways of truth, moderation, and charity, and we may reasonably suppose that his anger led him into exaggeration. When we compare his assertion (if taken literally) with the positive testimonies of Augustine and Cyprian himself, we are forced to deny it credence. Roncaglia, in an endeavor to prove that St. Cyprian was really excommunicated, thinks that Firmilian's declaration may be reconciled with these testimonies by supposing that the excommunication was withdrawn by Pope Stephen, or by his successor, Sixtus. Before passing to other questions, it is well to observe here that St. Cyprian

never incurred the stain of heresy, although he erred exceedingly. He was always ready to bow to the decisions of the Church, and again, as we shall soon see, he regarded the question at issue as one of discipline rather than of faith. The following passage of St. Augustine well shows the sincere yearning of Cyprian for truth, and his solicitude for unity (1): "Very often a little loss is revealed to the Doctors, that their patient and humble charity, in which there is greater fruit, may be tried; either as to the way of preserving unity, when they think variously on the more obscure matters, or as to their reception of the truth, when they see it declared in a sense contrary to what they thought. Of these two, we have one manifested in Blessed Cyprian, that is, how he preserved unity with those from whom he differed. For he says, 'judging no one, or removing no one from the right of communion, if he thinks otherwise.' And the other, that is, how he received the truth, when found contrary to what he had deemed it. If his letters do not record it, his merits proclaim it; if the epistle is not found, the crown (of martyrdom) attests it; if a council of bishops does not announce it, it is indicated by his being in the company of the angels. For it is no small proof of a most pacific soul, to have merited martyrdom in that unity, from which, though thinking differently, he would not separate. For we are men. Hence to relish a thing, when its nature prohibits it, is a trial to men. But to love one's own opinion excessively, or to grudge their ideas to the more justly thinking, to the point of breaking off communion and founding a schism, or to the point of committing the sacrilege of heresy, is diabolic presumption. . . . Having shed his blood, but shed it in unity, (Cyprian) attained angelic light through the confession of martyrdom, so that, if he did not know before what had been revealed, he knew it then, because he preferred the tie of unity to the assertion of his own opinion."

The question now arises as to the light in which the controversy was viewed by St. Cyprian, Firmilian, and the other rebaptizers of the time, who were in

(1) *Baptism, against the Donatists.*, b. 2, c. 5.

communion with them. Did they regard the question as one of faith, or of discipline? That they looked upon it as a mere matter of discipline, is easily proved. In the epistle sent by St. Cyprian and his brethren of the council of Carthage to Pope Stephen, we read, "We know that some do not wish to lay aside what they have once learned; that they do not easily change their minds, but wish, saving the tie of peace and concord with their colleagues, to retain what has been practiced among them. In which matter, we do violence or lay down a law to no one, since each bishop exercises his free will in the administration of his church, for which he will render an account to the Lord." But no bishop is free to act, according to his own opinion, in matters of faith; the fathers of Carthage, therefore, regarded the controversy as one of discipline. St. Jerome says that St. Cyprian never anathematized, but rather always communicated with, those who regarded his opinion as an error; if, however, the saint had thought his practice to be of faith, he could not have pursued such a course. These are the words of the great doctor (1): "However, if these do not wish. . . . to adduce from the Scriptures those texts which Blessed Cyprian has left in his epistles, concerning the rebaptism of heretics, let them know that he never proffered such sayings together with an anathema on those who would not agree with him. . . . And he finished the address, which he sent to Pope Stephen on the matter, with these words: 'We have proffered these things to your conscience, both for our common honor and for pure love, believing that what is religious and true will be also acceptable to you, for the sake of your own religion and faith'" (2).

Blondel and other Protestant writers, and in their day,

(1) *Dialogue against the Luciferians*, c. 9.

(2) If St. Cyprian believed that the question was one of faith, the definition of the African synod would certainly have made him a schismatic, which is not to be supposed possible, if we read his works. He could not be defended because of an example given by previous councils, for these did not judge of matters of faith, unless with the antecedent consent of the Church, or with the will to subject their decisions to the Church's judgment. In his epistle to Jubajan, St. Cyprian does not exclude a converted heretic from salvation, even though he be not "rebaptized;" he therefore must have regarded the effects of the old baptism as yet surviving, and therefore he must have looked upon the new baptism, for which he contended, as merely a disciplinary practice. It is certain that St. Cyprian did not hold as invalid a baptism conferred by a sinner; therefore, we may reasonably conclude that he regarded as valid that given by a heretic. See *Triumph of the Holy See*, by Cappellari (Pope Gregory XVI.), chap. 20.

some Gallican authors, have contended that, in his condemnation of St. Cyprian's error, Pope Stephen rushed into the extreme opposite one of approving every heretical baptism. How false this accusation is, we can very easily show. In his epistle to St. Cyprian, Firmilian says, "It is quite absurd for them to deem it unnecessary to inquire as to who baptized the person, saying that the grace can be attained by the invocation of the Trinity by name, that is, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Firmilian therefore supposes that Stephen insisted upon a certainty as to the use of the proper form, ere he would declare the validity of a baptism. Again, we know from Eusebius that the Pontiff defended the ancient practice of the Church, and the ancient practice was to insist upon the use of proper form and matter (1). Again, had Pope Stephen fallen into any error in his treatment of the question, Vincent of Lerins could not have said that he "crushed the novelty, and sustained the practice of antiquity" (2). And it is very unlikely, if Stephen had so erred, that the Council of Arles, when it issued a special canon against the rebaptizers, would have omitted to notice the opposite, and far more dangerous, heresy. Finally, if the Pontiff fell into such error, then the Church had erred through her entire extent, and therefore disappeared from the earth, which no Gallican, even in the palmiest days of his school, would admit to be possible. Certainly, at the time of the controversy as to rebaptism, the entire episcopacy received either the definition of Pope Stephen or the doctrine of St. Cyprian, and both, in the supposition of Stephen's fall, had wandered from the truth. The temerarious Launoy, in accordance with his system, which gained for him the title of "un-nicher of the saints" (3), drew up a series of what seemed to him terrible objections to the sanctity of Pope Stephen, and proofs that he had erred in the matter of St. Cyprian. Thus, he said, the Church always thought much more of Cyprian than of Stephen. Hear the praises which the fathers lavish upon Cyprian, and note how

(1) *History*, b. 7, c. 3.(2) *Commonitory*.

(3) The pastor of the church of St. Roch, at Paris, used to say, "Whenever I meet M. Launoy, I make him a profound bow, for fear that he will yet deprive me of my dear St. Roch."

seldom they speak of the Pontiff. In the Canon of the Mass, we have the name of Cyprian, not the other. In the ancient Litanies of the Roman Ordo and of the Rituals of the Churches of Gaul, Cyprian's name occurs, but never Stephen's. In the *Sacramentary* of St. Gregory and the olden Missals, we read a proper Preface for the Feast of Sts. Cornelius and Cyprian, but there is none for the Feast of St. Stephen. Anastasius, the Librarian, in his *Life* of Stephen, mentioning the *Constitutions* of the Pontiff, is silent as to the baptismal decree, as though, at Rome, where he wrote, they were ashamed of the Pope's course of action. All these allegations of Launoy simply show that St. Cyprian was more venerated than St. Stephen was; how a man of Launoy's acumen could draw from them any argument against the Pontiff's faith, is one of the many mysteries furnished by the devotees of Gallicanism and by those of many other "isms."

It has been also asserted that Pope St. Stephen decreed that baptism was valid when conferred only in the name of Christ. We must at once observe that both ancient and modern writers very frequently use the phrase "in the name of Christ," when they really mean to signify the names of the three Divine Persons; and the context, either direct or remote, will always show, if they are treating of sacramental forms, that the names of the Father and Holy Ghost are understood. To prove that Pope Stephen erred in this matter, it must be shown that he allowed the names of the Father and Holy Ghost to be omitted from the baptismal form, and that is impossible. It is true that a testimony to this effect can be adduced, which at first sight may seem conclusive, but, as we shall show, it must be rejected. St. Cyprian received from Jubajan an epistle said to have been written by Pope Stephen. In his 73rd letter, Cyprian declares that he had read in that epistle a definition to the effect that baptism in the sole name of Christ was valid, and he refutes the assertion. In answering this objection, we might say, with Alexandre, that the holy bishop of Carthage did not "penetrate the mind" of the Pontiff; that Stephen by the phrase "in the name of Christ" meant bap-

tism as instituted by Christ, and therefore conferred in the proper way. But it is difficult to believe that so perspicacious a mind as that of Cyprian would not have been able to penetrate the meaning of the Pope, or that so good a theologian would not have recognized the true meaning, if it were couched under a common form of expression. The most conclusive reply is that the epistle read by St. Cyprian was not written by St. Stephen. The Pontiff wrote indeed to the Primate of Africa, but it is unlikely that he would have written, in such unsettled and difficult times, to the bishop of an obscure place in the remote wilds, and there is no record of such an epistle. St. Cyprian does not ascribe it to Stephen, nor say anything which would indicate that he regarded him as its author, which he would have scarcely omitted to do, had there been any foundation for such a belief.

The opponents of Papal infallibility used to cite this difference of opinion between Sts. Stephen and Cyprian as favorable to their theory, but how they could derive any advantage from it we cannot perceive, since it is evident that both parties regarded the question as pertaining, not to faith, but to discipline. We may observe, however, that before the question of rebaptism arose, St. Cyprian often acknowledged the rights and prerogatives of the Apostolic See in explicit and reverential terms. Thus, when writing to Pope Cornelius against the schismatic Felicissimus, who had opposed his elevation to the see of Carthage, he said, "They dare to approach the chair of Peter, and to bear, from schismatics and the profane, letters to the principal Church, from which is derived the sacerdotal dignity; not thinking that they (the Roman clergy) are those Romans whose faith the Apostle praised, and to whom perfidy can have no access." And in his letter to Antonianus, "You asked me to send a copy of your letter to our colleague Cornelius. that, all anxiety laid aside, he might know that you communicate with him, that is, with the Catholic Church." Speaking to Pope Cornelius, he says, "We exhorted them to acknowledge and hold to the root and matrix of the Catholic Church . . . . . that all our col-

leagues should cling to thee and thy communion, that is, to the unity and charity of the Catholic Church." In his epistle, he requests Pope Stephen to use his authority against Marcian, bishop of Arles, who had become a Novatian. And in the entire controversy on rebaptism, he never calls the authority of the Pontiff into question, although he laments the injustice of the decision. If Cyprian was afterwards guilty of disobedience, we can only say that God permitted it for his correction. That he afterwards came to his senses is more than probable, although no documents give us the particulars of his recantation. The constant devotion of the Roman Church to his memory, and his own sacrifice of life for the faith, would prove that when he died, he was not at variance with the chief pastor of the fold.

---

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE SAMOSATIAN HERESY, AND THE COUNCIL OF ANTIOCH.

Paul, called Samosatenus, from his native place, Samosata, a village of the Euphratesian Syria, was made bishop of Antioch about the year 262, during the reign of the emperors Valerian and Galienus. Before his elevation he was poor, even to mendicancy, but he soon acquired immense wealth by means of oppression, sacrilege, and other wickedness. The fathers of the Council of Antioch, before whom he was accused of heresy in the year 264, say that he was exceedingly fond of parade. "Carried away, beyond all measure, by love of parade, and by his arrogance, he bore secular dignities, and preferred to be styled a ducenturion (1) rather than a bishop. He pompously strutted through the forum, openly and publicly reading, and dictating his correspondence as he promenaded, preceded and followed by an immense retinue; thus, through his luxury and haughtiness, the envy and hatred of many were excited

(1) The text has *ducentarius*, which can mean either the commander of two hundred soldiers, or a man possessing 200,000 sesterces.

against our faith" (1). His sermons were calculated solely to win glory and fame for the orator; hence, continue his fellow-bishops, "He scolded and insulted those who listened with the gravity and modesty which be seem the house of God, and who did not loudly applaud, as they do in the theatres, nor imitate his friends of both sexes in their shouts and leapings." After this, we need not be surprised to learn that "He picked to pieces the dead doctors of our law, but spoke of himself in grandiloquent terms, not as a bishop ought to speak, but like a sophist and an impostor. He abolished the singing of the Psalms which were always sung in honor of the Lord Jesus Christ, and placed a band of women in the middle of the church to sing certain Psalms in his own praise. And these persons who sing Psalms in his honor, . . . call him an angel, come down from heaven" His morals could not have been of a very ascetic nature, for the Antiochian prelates tell us that he was always accompanied by two beautiful women, and that he allowed his clergy, if they desired it, the constant society of certain females whom they called "Sisters." It would seem that Paul's heresy, like many others, could not come into the world without the connivance or prompting of some members of the fair sex, for it was to please no less a personage than the celebrated "queen of the East," Zenobia, that he made his first inroads upon the deposit of faith. This beautiful and talented princess was a Jewess, and from the time of her marriage to Odanathus, prince of Palmyra, cultivated the acquaintance of learned men. Paul, the Christian bishop of Antioch, was as erudite as any she met, and he possessed a certain eloquence and dictatorial manner which captivated her. He was not the man to forego the advantages of a friend at court, and the consequence was an intimacy which led him to please the Jewess by disguising the doctrines of Christianity.

His first and capital error was that Christ did not exist before His birth from Mary. When Christ was conceived, said he, the Word descended to dwell in Him, and by this temporal mission, became the Son. Nevertheless, Christ

(1) *Synodical Epistle.*

was eternal, by predestination. The fathers of the Council of Antioch say that "He refused to confess with us that the Son descended from heaven. . . . Nor is this simply our assertion; it is declared more than once in the records which we have sent to you, especially where he says that Jesus Christ had His origin from the earth. . . . having abjured the mystery of our religion, he passed to the execrable heresy of Artemas" (1). From this error, Paul logically drew that of two Persons in Christ, one by nature, the other by adoption. Of this heresy, St. Dionysius of Alexandria wrote to him, saying, "Thou sayest there are two hypostases, and two Persons in the One and Only Christ, and two Christs and two Sons; one by nature the Son of God, who was before all time, and one, the Son of David, who was not before, but who, by the pleasure of God, took the name of Son, as a city takes the name of its lord, and a house the name of its builder." Other errors, consequent upon these, Paul developed in a list of *Questions* sent by him to Dionysius. Christ was by nature a man like ourselves; the hypostasis of the Word and the Crucified are not the same; He who hungered, thirsted, labored, &c., was not God. His next error was akin to that of Sabellius, and must have been especially pleasing to Zenobia. He explicitly denied the doctrine of the Trinity, asserting that the Word was not a Person, distinct from the Father, but merely the efficiency of the Father. Speaking of this doctrine, St. Epiphanius says (2): "The opinion of Paul is that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God; the Word and His Spirit are perpetually in God, as his own word is in the heart of man; the Son of God has no subsistence by Himself, but subsists in God. The Word of God, coming into the world, dwelt in Jesus, who was a mere man. Thus, he says, God is one. . . . that one God is the Father, and the Son is in Him, as the word is in man." The points of difference between the Samosatian doctrine and that of Sabellius and Nestorius, are given as fol-

(1) Artemas was a heretic of the 2d century, who taught that Christ was a mere man. Eusebius speaks of him in his *Hist.*, b. 7, c. 22.

(2) *Heresies*, 65.

lows by Leontius (1): "He erred as to the Divinity and the Incarnation. As to the Divinity, because he acknowledged only the Father. As to the Incarnation, because he asserted that Christ was merely a man. . . . nor did he teach the same as Nestorius; for although Nestorius said that Christ was simply a man, yet he acknowledged as dwelling in Him the Word and Son of God, who subsists by Himself. For Nestorius erred in nothing as to the Trinity. But Paul of Samosata did not acknowledge in Christ the Word of God which subsists by Itself; he called the Word a something ordered, that is, God commanded (as he expressed the idea) what He wished to be done through that man and did perform through him. Nor was the opinion of Paul, as to the Divinity, that of Sabellius. For Sabellius said that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were the same; he called God a Being of three names, and admitted no Trinity whatever; while Paul did not say that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were the same, but asserted that the Father was the God who created all things, the Son being a mere man, and the Holy Ghost the gift that descended upon the apostles." Paul also erred as to the formula of Baptism; at least, his followers did. Hence the Council of Nice, in its nineteenth canon, decreed that the Paulianists (as they were generally called) should be baptized, when they applied for admission into the fold.

Against the heretical bishop of Antioch a synod was held in the year 264, during the Pontificate of Pope Dionysius. Among the more celebrated prelates who attended it, were St. Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea and Firmilian of Cæsarea in Cappadocia; St. Dionysius of Alexandria excused himself on account of sickness and old age. Paul disguised his opinions, and protested that the alleged doctrines were not his; the bishops therefore contented themselves with condemning the heresies, without pronouncing any censure against him. But Paul soon began to teach his errors so openly that evasion was no longer possible, and in another synod, held in the year 270, he was condemned and deposed from his see. Then was witnessed the curious spectacle of

(1) *On the Sects, action 2.*

an appeal to a Pagan emperor, made by Catholic bishops against a rebellious brother. Paul refused to yield up the temporalities of the diocese to his successor, Domnus, and the bishops of the province applied to Aurelian for his ejection. The emperor entertained the appeal, and gave the very just decision that the temporalities should be secured to whomsoever the Roman Pontiff and the Christian bishops of the Italian province should designate as legitimate bishop of Antioch (1). Sympathizing more or less with all of the early heretics, Mosheim (2) tries to justify Paul, or rather, since that would be too difficult a task, to cast suspicion upon the motives of those who condemned him. He ignores any zeal for truth on their part, and supposes that they were actuated by envy of Paul's wealth, and by jealousy of his influence. If the Protestant historian could bring forth any documents or any substantial reasons for this suspicion, we might abstain from accusing him of pure maliciousness, but, as it is, the records of the time are against him, and the characters of so many of the subscribers to the *Acts* of the synod are of proven sanctity, that we need do no more than refer to him as another instance of historical acumen rendered null by party spirit.

Coming now to an important question which arises from a perusal of the decrees of the Council of Antioch, we must first draw attention to one of Paul's prime sophisms. If Jesus did not become God, he said, He is not consubstantial to the Father, and hence there are three substances, one principal and two derivative (3). Now since it is because the Son *is* consubstantial to the Father, that there are not three substances, the argument of Paul is absurd, if he used the term "consubstantial" as we now use it. St. Athanasius has been said to have believed that the fathers of Antioch rejected the word "consubstantial," and that they did so, taking the word in another sense, in which it might have been used by Paul, namely, that there were three substances formed from one pre-existing *materia*. However this may be, it is certain that the prelates assembled

(1) EUSEBIUS; *Hist.*, b. 7, c. 23. THEODORET; *Fables*, b. 2, § 35.

(2) *Hist. Christ.*, sect. 7, § 35.

(3) FLEURY; *History*, b. 8, n. 1.

at Antioch formally taught that the Son of God is equal and co-eternal with the Father. We now proceed to examine the question, whether or not the fathers of Antioch rejected the term *homoousios*, "consubstantial," because Paul of Samosata had so abused it as to deceive many, even well meaning persons. This term, as we shall afterwards see, became, during the progress of Arianism, the test, as it were, of orthodoxy, and the opponents of the true doctrine on the Incarnation were fond of citing this synod of Antioch as favorable to their heresy (1). To show that it was a moral impossibility for the fathers of Antioch to reject the term "consubstantial," it is only necessary to consider the events which happened at Alexandria, scarcely ten years before the celebration of their synod, on account of a reported unwillingness of Dionysius to accept the term. This holy bishop had been accused, before Pope Dionysius, of this hesitancy, by certain Pentapolitans, who declared that he "styled the Son a creature, and not consubstantial to the Father." Having called a synod at Rome, the Pontiff wrote to the Alexandrian bishop, asserting the necessity of the term in question. Indignant at the accusation, the prelate repelled it in the strongest of language, and to further clear himself, sent to the Pope four of his books, which plainly proved that he held the consubstantiality of the Son, and received the term *homoousion* as a test of the doctrine. Now, is it at all probable that so many learned and holy bishops, as were those assembled at Antioch, would, not ten years afterwards, have sent to this very Pontiff Dionysius, during the life too of the very prelate whom he had ordered to receive the term, a synodical epistle which rejected the word *homoousion*? Again, would not the Antiochian fathers have seemed demented, if, while condemning an impious and most dangerous heresy, they rejected the very term which, of all possible terms, most conclusively indicated the one true doctrine? And how is it that the Arians never objected that the term had been rejected at Antioch? It would have been an excellent argument for their cause, they never

(1) The student will find this question treated most thoroughly in the work of Maran on the "Divinity of our Lord J. C., Manifested in Scripture and Tradition," b. 4, c. 20. We shall merely give a synopsis of this author's argumentation.

missed a chance, and yet they never alleged even a suspicion of such a thing. No such assertion was ever made until nearly ninety years had elapsed since the holding of the synod, and then it was made by the Semiarians at the synod of Ancyra, in the year 358. And although it was greatly to the interest of these Semiarians to prove their assertion, yet it always remained a simple assertion, without an attempt at proof. It is worthy of note that Eusebius of Cæsarea, who certainly was not very hostile to the Arians, while commemorating the anti-Nicene writers who received the term *homoousion*, says that he found none who rejected it, and in his seventh book he gives us that part of the Synodical Epistle of Antioch which alone has come down to us. And in that portion, nothing can be gathered which would give rise to the slightest suspicion that in the lost part there was a rejection of the term. Finally, the Antiochian fathers could not, in their epistle, have rejected a word, the use of which they defend in their Symbol (1).

Those who contend that the term *homoousios* was rejected at Antioch, rely upon certain passages of Sts. Hilary, Athanasius, and Basil, in trying to defend their position. But St. Hilary does not assert the rejection of the word, as his own opinion; he simply proffers the objection as coming from the Semiarians. The same may be said of St. Athanasius, for, in treating of the objection, he says, in parenthesis, "as they say, for I have not a copy of the epistle," and he shortly adds, "If I possessed a copy of the epistle, which they say the fathers wrote, I believe I would find several reasons why they may have been forced to write in such a manner." As for St. Basil, he certainly says, in his 52nd epistle, that some excuse may be made for those who receive the Nicene decrees, excepting the word "consubstantial," because "those who met in the case of Paul of Samosata condemned the term as less apt and convenient." If such was St. Basil's opinion, then he showed much confidence in the Semiarian assertion, but his solitary judgment is of little weight when compared with the arguments we have adduced.

(1) This Symbol is found in Hardouin, *Councils*, vol. 1, p. 1639, and the erudite entertains no doubt as to its genuineness.

## CHAPTER XIII.

## THE CONVERSION AND BAPTISM OF CONSTANTINE.

Eusebius tells us, in his *Life of Constantine*, that while that emperor was marching on Rome to meet the tyrant Maxentius (310), and was reflecting upon the difficulty of his undertaking, he remembered that his father, Constantius Chlorus, worshipped only one God, and that, unlike most of the Roman emperors, he was a happy man. Constantine therefore resolved to devote his worship to the one only God, and "he began," says Eusebius, in chap. 28, "to implore His aid, beseeching Him to make Himself known unto him, and to extend His helping hand to the present enterprise." Then occurred that signal miracle of the appearance of a cross in the sky, and Christ's manifestation of Himself to Constantine on the following night. Our Lord explained the meaning of the miracle to the emperor, ordered him to adopt the cross as his standard, and promised him victory. Constantine then sent for some Christian priests, and having acquired the rudiments of Christian doctrine, was enrolled among the catechumens. The following are the words of the historian: "A wonderful sign, sent by God, appeared to the emperor as he was simply praying. If the event were narrated by any other person, it would not easily be believed. But since the august victor himself told it to us, who write this history, some time after it happened; when, that is, we had become familiar with him; and since he attested the declaration with his oath, who can hesitate in believing it? . . . . . About the middle of the day, as the sun was turning to the west, he saw, with his own eyes, he asserted, immediately over the sun, a figure of the cross made up of light, and with it the inscription '*En touto nika*' (In this, conquer). At this vision, both he and the soldiers, who were following him on I know not what journey, and were witnesses of the miracle, were thoroughly stupefied." Many Pagan authors are mentioned by Gelasius of Cyzicus (1), as rejecting this vision of

(1) *Council of Nice*, b. 1, c. 4.

Constantine as false or imaginary, and as a rule, Protestants are too averse to any admission of miracles, to receive this one as authentic. That Voltaire should rank the story among fables (1), is not surprising. If a wish to disbelieve be any reason for rejecting an assertion, then those who are incredulous as to this miracle are not unreasonable. As for any more solid argument against it, the rules of criticism furnish none. Eusebius is not alone in his narration, and even if he were, his authority would be great indeed, living, as he did, at the time it is said to have happened, and publishing it, as he did, in the hearing of those whom he declares to have been witnesses to it. What about the oath of Constantine? What about the coins and medals struck by Constantine in commemoration of the vision, and which have come down to us? But Eusebius is corroborated by two Pagan authors, one, the famous orator, Nazarius, the other anonymous (2). The story of the vision is also given by the author of the book on "The Deaths of the Persecutors" and by Optatian Porphyry, the poet. Prudentius, Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoret, all agree in believing in its truth. And of no small value as an argument of its authenticity is the sign of the cross on the military insignia of the early Christian emperors, and on many of the public monuments of the day.

We now approach the question as to where and when Constantine received the sacrament of baptism. The great mass of authors, until within the last two centuries, held that he was baptized at Rome about the year 324, by Pope St. Sylvester. The popular tradition in the Eternal City has always been to that effect. One of the principal complaints made by the enemies of Cola di Rienzo in 1347, was that he had been guilty of profanation, by bathing in the sacred font of Constantine. But the weight of evidence is too much for this tradition, and goes to show that the emperor was baptized only at the close of his life, and in the suburbs of Nicomedia. The principal defenders of the Nicomedian baptism are Mamachi, Papebrock, Henri de Va-

(1) *Essay on General History*, c. 5.

(2) Their stories are found in the Parisian edition of Pliny's *Epistles*, of 1599.

lois, Pagi, Aeneas Silvius, Alexandre, Mosheim, and Palma. Among the modern approvers of the Roman baptism the chief place is held by Baronio. But though it is more probable that Constantine's baptism was deferred until he was about to die, it would be incorrect to say that he was at heart a Pagan up to that time, as some have asserted. This accusation must be repelled, before we treat of his baptism. As Mosheim notes, the facts, laws, and institutions of his reign, show that Constantine had embraced the Christian religion with his whole soul. All his efforts were for the establishment of that faith, and for the destruction of Paganism. In the interests of Christianity, he changed nearly the entire system of Roman jurisprudence; he richly endowed the bishops and priests, and provided in every way for the splendor and accuracy of divine worship. From the day of his vision, he constantly praised and worshipped Christ; he brought up his children in the faith. It is foolish to object certain events of his life as abhorrent to the spirit of the Gospel. Thus, the killing of his son Crispus and the execution of his own wife Fausta (1), his vanity and voluptuousness, do not militate against his Christianity. Are there no bad Christians? Of no value to the theory of Constantine's persistent Paganism, especially when compared with the known facts of his life, is the passage of Eusebius where he is said to have "first merited to receive the imposition of hands with solemn prayer" at Nicomedia. For these words do not necessarily imply that only then Constantine became a catechumen; there were several impositions of hands upon the candidate, ere he finally received baptism. Nor is it at all unlikely that a man in Constantine's elevated position would not have been subjected to all the ceremonies usually adopted at an induction among the catechumens; in which case, the passage of Eusebius is at once understood. We know from Eusebius himself that the emperor was present at the divine services, that he kept the Lord's Day and the feasts of the martyrs, that he fasted at the appointed times, that he kept the vig-

(1) Crispus was accused of high treason, and of attempted outrage on herself by Fausta, his stepmother. The emperor revenged him by ordering Fausta's death.

il of Easter, &c.; we know too that he allowed himself to be excluded from all in which catechumens could not participate. He must, therefore, have been a catechumen long before the journey to Nicomedia, and in the quoted passage of Eusebius, the phrase "first merited" applies to the last and final imposition of hands before baptism. Arguments for the theory of Constantine's continued Paganism have been found in the restoration of the temple of Concord at Rome, in his decree for the consultation of omens, and in the fact that he retained the title of "Supreme Pontiff." With regard to the temple of Concord, we answer that the inscription proves that the Senate and Roman people (S. P. Q. R.) restored it, but not that Constantine did so (1). The decree as to the consultation of omens proves simply that he could not all at once do away with Pagan superstition. He tolerated the augurs by a law of the year 320, which is found in the code of Theodosius, b. 16, tit. 10, No. 1, and its words show that he looked upon their system as a superstition. If Constantine was at heart a Pagan because he bore the title of "Supreme Pontiff," then so were many of his successors, for not until the year 375 was the appellation dropped by Gratian. From the time of his vision, however, he never officiated as Pontiff, nor did he ever sacrifice to the gods. He kept the title, lest it should be taken up by some one else in the interests of the dying system, and not from any affection to the office.

And now for the time and place of Constantine's baptism. Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine*, b. 4, c. 61 and 62, gives the circumstances as follows: "In the beginning he was attacked by an uneven temperature of the body, and then by illness. Therefore he went to the warm waters of his city, and then he was taken to Helenopolis, where, pausing for a long time in the church of the Martyrs, he offered supplications and prayers to God. When he felt that the end of life was imminent, he thought that at length the time had come for him to expiate the faults of his whole

(1) Palma speaks of two inscriptions, one of which is addressed to Constantine by the S. P. Q. R., but contains nothing attributing the restoration to him: the other treats of the restoration by the S. P. Q. R., but says nothing at all of the emperor. "There are some," he says, "who think that, through the fault of some ignorant man, these two inscriptions have been made into one."

life ; most firmly believing that whatever sin he had committed, through human frailty, would be wiped out by the efficacy of the secret words, and the salutary immersion. Having thought these things, kneeling on the ground, he humbly begged pardon of God, confessing his sins in the same church of the Martyrs, and in that place he first merited to receive the imposition of hands with solemn prayer. Thence having gone as far as the suburbs of Nicomedia, calling the bishops, he addressed to them these words : ‘ This is the time for which I have long hoped, for which I have longed with incredible desire, which I have asked for with my every prayer, that I might attain salvation in God. Now is the time when we also should receive the sign *which confers immortality*; now is the time for us to be made participants of the salutary seal. Truly, I had once decided to do this in the river Jordan, in which, for our example, our Saviour Himself received the immersion. But God, who best knows what is useful for us, deigns that it should be done in this place. Therefore, let all doubt be removed. For if God, the arbiter of life and death, wishes me to live longer here, and it is decreed that I am hereafter to mingle with the people of God, and that, aggregated to the Church, I am to partake of her prayers with the rest, I promise to prescribe for myself such laws of living as are due to God.’ When he had said this, they performed the divine ceremonies with solemn rite, and enjoining upon him what was necessary, they made him a participant in the Sacred Mysteries. Of all the emperors who have ever been, Constantine alone, &c.” There is only one way of escaping from this testimony of Eusebius, and that is at once adopted by Baronio, firmest of all those who believe in the emperor’s baptism at Rome. No confidence is to be placed in Eusebius, in this matter at least, says the father of Ecclesiastical Annals, since he was tinged with Arianism, and naturally drew a curtain over the baptism by Pope Sylvester, that he might consult the feelings of Constantius, the Arian son of Constantine. But Eusebius is not merely silent as to the baptism at Rome; if he were, the conjecture of Baronio might demand attention. He

positively asserts the Nicomedian baptism, knowing, that if he lies, there are hundreds living who can brand him as he deserves. Again, how could such a lie be a salve to the feelings of Constantius? Was this prince so much more ignorant of affairs than the rest of the world, as to be unaware of his father's intense aversion for Arianism? He well knew that he was not following in the footsteps of Constantine; hence, there was no solid reason why Eusebius should, for the sake of his tender feelings, frame so tremendous a lie. We will merely allude to Socrates, Sozomenus, Theodoret, Sts. Jerome, and Ambrose, as agreeing with Eusebius in this matter, and pass to the arguments generally adduced by those who contend that Constantine was baptized at Rome.

Their principal argument is derived from the *Acts of St. Sylvester*, and the records of a Roman synod held in the year 324, which assert that the emperor was baptized and cured of a leprosy by that Pontiff. But neither these *Acts* nor the records of the synod are genuine. Alexandre (1) details many reasons why the *Acts* should be rejected, of which we will give one as a specimen of all. They narrate that in the year 315 a synod was held at Rome, at which attended 75 bishops, and 109 Jewish priests; 12 of the latter having been sent by the high-priest, Isachar, to dispute on religion with their patroness, the empress Helena, and with Constantine. For, they say, Helena was yet a Pagan, but almost converted to Judaism, and was violently angry with her son because of his Christian proclivities, and had begged him to become a Jew. Is not all this trash? Passing by the absurdities, do we not know that, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews ceased to create high-priests, and that the very name of Pontiff had grown obsolete among them? We cannot, therefore, yield homage to the *Acts of Sylvester*. As for the cited records, they represent a synod which was never held. In the first place, they speak of the heresy of Photinus, which did not arise before the year 343, and treat of it as condemned, while it was not condemned before the Sirmian council of 351. We pass several

(1) *Fourth cent.*, dis. 23.

other intrinsic proofs of falsity, and ask if women, even though they were empresses, were ever admitted into the synods of the Church? Yet these records present Helena as even subscribing to the decrees. Again, this synod appears to have been so lacking in the roughest kind of common sense, that no one can believe it other than fictitious. Among its canons is this one: "No bishop shall bless the marriage of a sacred virgin unless he knows her to be seventy-two years of age." Another canon says that "no bishop shall be condemned unless by seventy-two witnesses; no priest, without forty-four, &c." In the 13th canon, it is established that "no one shall attain clerical honors unless he has first received the sacred veil of marriage at the hands of a priest." It is evident then that no value can be attached to the testimony of such records. The *Acts of Liberius* are also produced in favor of the Roman baptism. According to them, Constantius was highly indignant because Liberius said that Constantine had been cured of leprosy when he was baptized by St. Sylvester. Baronio himself admits that these *Acts* are full of errors, and the ancient writers are silent in their regard, although they are most diligent in collecting all possible evidence bearing upon the contest of Liberius with Constantius. And why should Constantius be specially angry with Liberius for asserting that which, if true, must have been as yet fresh in the minds of many?

It is incredible, say the defenders of the Sylvestrian baptism, that Constantine should have been so superstitious as to put off his baptism, merely that he might receive it in the Jordan. And whose example encouraged him to defer so important an act to the end of his life? Besides, if he really wished to be baptized in the holy river, why did he not avail himself of the opportunity, when he was at Jerusalem for the dedication of the new temple? To this we may answer that there was no superstition in desiring to be baptized in the waters sanctified by contact with the body of Christ. That the waters of the Jordan were often bathed in with a religious devotion, we know from Eusebius and St. Jerome; especially on the feast of the Epiphany,

the faithful were wont to don the shroud they were to wear in the grave, and descend into the river to be blessed by the priest. A spirit of piety, therefore, and not of superstition, animated Constantine when he wished to be baptized in those waters (1). As for the examples by which the emperor was influenced, they matter little, but we know that he was not alone in deferring his baptism, however we may condemn the delay. Valentinian died a catechumen; Constantius remained one for many years. Nectarius, and Sts. Ambrose and Augustine were baptized in mature age; the last tells us it was common in his time (2). The observation upon the opportunity furnished by the dedication at Jerusalem is of no importance; we wish not to know what the emperor might have done, but what he did.

But, it is urged, if Constantine was baptized in the year 337 at Nicomedia, he must have been baptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia, who was an Arian; hence, he became an Arian, which is absurd. It does not follow from the fact of his having been baptized at Nicomedia, that Constantine was baptized by Eusebius, bishop of that city. Had he so been, the equally Arian Eusebius of Cæsarea would gladly have mentioned the fact. Gelasius of Cyzicus (3) tells us "he was baptized by an orthodox priest, and not, as some have said, by some one of the heretics." And the Pagan historian Zosimus, in the peculiarly Pagan way of treating Christian matters, says that the emperor was purified by a Spanish magician; might it not then, asks Alexandre, have been Hosius of Cordova, who was so often in his suite, and was very dear to him, who performed the ceremony? Finally, even though we grant that Constantine was baptized by Eusebius of Nicomedia, it does not follow that he became an Arian, for that bishop had subscribed to the Nicene faith, and professed himself a Catholic.

A reconciliation between the description of Eusebius and the theory of the Sylvestrian baptism was attempted by

(1) St. Jerome, translating Eusebius (*Loc. Heb.*), writes: "Bethabara, across the Jordan, where John was accustomed to baptize unto penance. Hence, even to-day, many of the faithful desire to be there reborn, and are there baptized in the life-giving waters."

(2) *Confessions*, b. 1, c. 10.

(3) See PHOTIUS, *Bibliotheca*, Cod. 88.

Bianchini (1), who applied the words of the historian to Constantine's reception of the sacraments of Penance and Confirmation. The phrase, "kneeling on the ground, he humbly asked pardon of God, confessing his sins," naturally refers, he says, to confession; while, among the Greeks, it was common to speak of Confirmation as "the divine seal." But this theory, while ingenious, is not solid. Eusebius expressly states that Constantine received the sign "which confers immortality," and that phrase applies only to Baptism. Again, of Baptism it is properly said, of Confirmation it cannot be predicated, that it makes one a participant in the sacred mysteries; that by it one is reborn, renovated, &c.; that through it one is allowed to mix with the people of God. Finally, how could Constantine have wished to receive Confirmation by the banks of the Jordan? Chrism, not water, is the matter of the sacrament of Confirmation.

So grievous were the suspicions excited in some minds by the circumstances of the baptism of Constantine, that, when compared with certain events of his life, they led to a belief that this first Christian emperor had become an Arian. A few remarks, therefore, upon the faith of Constantine will not be amiss at the close of this dissertation. He certainly was cruel to Athanasius and other defenders of the Nicene Creed; he was undeniably very familiar with the Arians, or, to speak more correctly, with the Semiarians; and he may have, as Rufinus says, consigned his last will and testament to an Arian priest. St. Jerome, in his *Chronicle*; Lucifer of Cagliari, in his book addressed to the emperor; Sulpitius Severus, in his *History*; Rufinus, also in his *History*, all speak of him as an Arian. And nevertheless, it is easy to show that, in his life, and at his death, the faith of Constantine was orthodox. During his life, the Arians did not dare to attack the faith of Nice; even, in the time of Constantius, when they tried to do so at Antioch, they declared, "We certainly are not acolytes of Arius . . . . nor do we receive any faith but that delivered in the beginning." If, therefore, Constantine was familiar with the Eusebians,

(1) *Historical Notes to Anastasius the Librarian.*

he ought not be supposed to have been drawn by them into Arianism. Again, Athanasius, whom Constantine had exiled, upbraids Constantius because he does not imitate the faith and piety of his father (1). After the death of Constantine, Athanasius, in an interview with the youngest son, Constans, pays the same tribute to the faith of the parent (2). St. Hilary styles Constantius "a rebel heir of the paternal piety" (3). St. Epiphanius says that Constantius, "while otherwise pious, and endowed with many ornaments of virtue, wandered in this one thing, that he did not follow the parental footsteps in the faith" (4). Finally, the ancient Menologies of the Greek Church number Constantine among the saints, and although Rome has never approved that canonization, any more than she has the popular canonization of Charlemagne by some of the peoples of Europe, yet the insertion of his name in the sacred dyptichs is a strong argument for the orthodoxy of Constantine. The combined authority of St. Jerome, Lucifer of Cagliari, Sulpitius Severus, and Rufinus, proving, as they all do, at the most, that Constantine was deceived by the enemies of Athanasius, is of far less weight in determining the faith of that sovereign, than the favorable testimony of the saintly hero of Alexandria, who was for so many years in the thick of the fight, and had far better opportunities of forming a correct opinion upon Arian matters than they could have possessed. The opinion of Athanasius as to the faith of Constantine may be gathered from the passages already quoted, and from the following, taken from the *Epistle to Solitaries*: "The father (Constantine), on account of the calumnies of the Eusebians, sent Athanasius into Gaul for a time, where he would be free from the cruelty of those who tried to ensnare him . . . . . And if he did admit Arius into his presence, when he knew him for a perjuror, . . . . . he showed no good will to him, but, the affair being known, he regarded him as condemned, and as a heretic."

(1) *Epistle to Solitaries*.(2) *Theodoret*, b. 2, c. 4.(3) *B. I., to Constantius*.(4) *On Heresies No. 69*.

## CHAPTER XIV.

## PUBLIC PENANCE AND AURICULAR CONFESSION.

We have already seen that, in the first ages of Christianity, such persons as were guilty of idolatry and certain other grave sins, were obliged to perform public penance before they could be restored to the communion of the faithful. That this custom was in full vigor in the days of Tertullian (born A. D. 150) appears from his book on *Penance*, c. 9., where he says that penance is a discipline for the humiliation of man; that in its course he should be clothed in sackcloth, and sprinkled with ashes; that his soul should be cast down in grief, and his body treated with contempt; that he should nourish his prayers with fasting and weep by day and by night; that he should have recourse to the priests, and ask the prayers of the dear ones of God. And St. Cyprian (died, 258) tells us, speaking of those who had fallen into idolatry, "They should pray more earnestly, pass the day in grief, and the night in watches and in weeping, spend the whole time in tearful lamentations; they should lie prostrate on the ground in ashes, be covered with sackcloth and dirt; having lost Christ for a vestment, they should wish no other clothing; having eaten the food of the devil, they should prefer to fast; they should attend to good works, through which sins are washed out, and often give alms, through which their souls may be freed from death." But St. Gregory of Neo-Cæsarea (210-270) called the "Worker of Miracles," is the first author who expressly mentions the four classes into which the public penitents were divided. They were the weepers, the hearers, the prostrate, and those who remained (*consistentes*). In his canonical epistle, written about the year 263, in reference to those who had eaten food offered to the idols during the barbarian inroad into Pontus, and about whose treatment he was consulted, the saint describes, in the eleventh canon (1), the state

(1) The authenticity of this canon is proved by Nat. Alexander, in *diss.* 18, 4th cent.

of each of these classes. The weepers were kept entirely outside the church, and they there besought the faithful who were entering, to pray for them. The hearers were admitted within the doors, but restricted to a part of the nave called *narthex*, where they could hear the sermon. The prostrate, though mentioned as a separate class, are comprehended by St. Gregory under the same rules as the hearers, both being sent out of the church with the catechumens before the Offertory. The remaining penitents were allowed to hear the whole mass, but could not receive the Holy Eucharist. Thus we see that the weepers alone were, of all classes of humanity, entirely excluded from the services of the Church. We learn from the 4th Council of Carthage, can. 84, that Pagans, Jews, and heretics, were permitted to be present up to the Offertory, in order to receive some amount of instruction. This, however, must be understood of the time when the Discipline of the Secret had been relaxed, for while that system was in force, outsiders were rigidly excluded. All penitents wore a peculiar dress. The stuff was clean, but sprinkled with ashes; it was of sackcloth or even of haircloth. The hair was dishevelled, and so far as was consistent with modesty, the appearance of the body betokened contempt of conventionality. During the penitential course, arms could not be borne, nor could its subjects assist at weddings and other reunions of society. The time was passed in rigid fasting, in prayer, in vigils, and every kind of bodily mortification. These particulars we learn from the 2nd Council of Arles, can. 21; St. Leo the Great, *epist.* 92; Tertullian, book *on Penance*; St. Jerome, *epist. to Oceanus* on the death of Fabiola; 3rd Council of Toledo, can. 12.

It may be asked whether this public penance was rendered more painful by a public confession of the sin committed. Certainly, the spectators might easily conjecture the nature of the sin by noting the time spent in penance, which would amount to a confession on the part of the penitent. Thus, we know from St. Basil, in his canons to Amphilocheus, that adulterers passed fifteen years in penance, four among the weepers, five with the hearers, four

with the prostrate, and two with those remaining to the end of mass. However, such conjecture would not be very conclusive, for it often happened that humility and fervor prompted a penitent to remain in discipline long beyond the prescribed time. But sometimes there was a public and explicit confession, especially when the crime was notorious. This we learn from St. Jerome, who describes the avowal and penance of Fabiola, a noble lady, who under the impression that the adultery of her husband had dissolved her marriage, publicly espoused another. When, however, the sin was secret, it depended upon the will of the penitent whether a public confession should be made. St. Ambrose, in his work *on Penance*, book 2. c. 10, exhorts to public penance those whom shame is keeping therefrom, and he founds his argument upon the idea that shame should not deter from public humiliation before God, him whom shame has not withheld from the private confession to a priest. "Should it shame you to supplicate God from whom you are not hidden, when it does not shame you to confess your sins to a man to whom you are hidden?" This method of reasoning could not have been adopted, had public confession been inseparable from public penance. Again, the fourth and tenth Councils of Toledo, in canons 12 and 10 respectively, decide that no one shall be debarred from Holy Orders on account of a public penance which was unaccompanied by public confession. Now we know that the public knowledge of his crimes would render a candidate irregular for Orders. Therefore, since men who had undergone public penance were sometimes admitted to Orders, it follows that said penance was not always accompanied by, or even necessarily equivalent to, a public confession. Finally, St. Leo the Great, *epist.* 238 (*alias* 80), speaking of public penance, expressly teaches that a private confession to a priest is sufficient, without any public manifestation of the particular crime. Here we take occasion to note that in the African Church, at least at one period, a public confession of a hitherto unknown crime could not take place. For in the third Council of Carthage, can. 32, public penance is absolutely forbidden "unless

on account of a public and most notorious crime, known to the whole Church. With regard to this matter of public confession, we may safely say with Petau, that it was never *prescribed* by the Church, but sometimes allowed, for the sake of edification.

The public penitents received from the priest two kinds of "imposition of hands." One was "deprecatory," and was given each time they were dismissed, before the Offertory; the other was sacramental and "absolatory," and was only given when the penance was completed. When it happened that danger of death came upon one as yet in the course of penance, absolution was of course conceded, but with the obligation, in case of recovery, of completing the interrupted discipline. At the time of their "reconciliation," the ex-penitents always received Holy Communion. See St. Ambrose, book 2, on *Penance*.

From the nature of the system of Canonical Penance, we are prepared to hear that few crimes were subject to its discipline. We learn from Tertullian, on *Purity*, c. 14 and 12, and from Pacianus, that they can be reduced to the heads of infidelity, luxury, and homicide. "These three crimes are to be feared as the breath of the basilisk, as a cup of poison, as a deadly arrow. What shall the contemner of God do, what the bloody man? What remedy shall the fornicator take? Can he who deserts Him, pacify the Lord? Can he consecrate His blood who has spilled another's? Can he reconstruct the temple of God, who by fornication has violated it in himself? These things are capital, brethren, these are mortal." St. Gregory of Nazienzen (328-389) in his *epistle to Lactorius*, seeks a reason for the Church's severity against these crimes, in their connection with the prominent activities of the soul: reason, concupiscence, and anger. Impiety towards God perverts the whole reasoning faculty; anger causes homicide, concupiscence brings forth every species of impurity. Under the heading of infidelity, he classes all recourse to magicians, all incantations, all invocations to the demon. The first Council of Arles, can. 14, subjects to public penance the perpetrators of forgery, false witnesses, and calumniators of character.

The system of public penance flourished in the Church for twelve centuries, and in the last two of its existence, although formerly penitents could not bear arms, it was commuted for participation in the crusades. (1) Some Protestant authors have contended that it was from this discipline that arose the Catholic practice of auricular confession; that, in fact, the custom of private and secret confession only came into use when the ancient system of public and general confession was abolished. It is outside of our historical province to defend the Catholic doctrine on this subject, but we will not enter the special domain of dogmatic theology, if we show, by the light of history, that ancient writers recognized both private and public confession. Origen (185-254), in his *2nd Homily on the 37th Psalm*, tells all sinners who may think of doing public penance, to first confess their sins to a priest, and then act according to his judgment. "Seek diligently," he says, "for one to whom you may confess your sins. Try the physician, to whom you will expose the cause of your malady. . . . that so, at length, if he says anything, who first shows himself to be a merciful and learned physician, if he gives any counsel, you may follow it. If he understands, and foresees, that your trouble should be exposed and cured in an assembly of the whole church, so that perhaps others may be edified, and you yourself easily healed, this should be arrived at with much deliberation." Here certainly we find that upon the private confession was to depend the feasibility of the public penance in a particular case. We may adduce the testimony of St. Cyprian (died 258) who in his book on *The Fallen*, speaking of those who had bought certificates of compliance, though they had not really been guilty of idolatry, says, "Of how much greater faith and fear are those who, although stained by no crime either of sacrifice or of certificate, yet, having thought to commit the act, do now in simplicity and grief confess this to the priests of God, and make a confession of conscience, (*sic*) lay open the burden

(1) As to the treatment of the clergy, under the system of public penance, there is a variety of opinion, some authors contending that not even the higher clergy were exempt from its application. See the dissertations of Cabassut and Coustant, inserted by Zaccaria in his Latin edition of Fleury's *Discipline of the People of God*.

of their souls, and receive the healing cure for even their little wounds." Surely by the term "confession of conscience" the saint cannot mean a public avowal; the very word implies secrecy. We learn from Anastasius the Librarian that Pope Simplicius (467) ordered that on certain days priests should be in attendance at the basilicas of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. Laurence, on account of penitents and baptisms. In the Roman *Penitential*, tit. 8, Pope Symmachus (498) says: "All whom we receive in penance, are thereby our spiritual children, just as are those whom we have taken from the font, or whom we have immersed therein, and whom the baptismal water has regenerated." This spiritual affinity could not be contracted with public penitents merely because of their being such; again, the comparison with baptism shows that Symmachus supposes his *penance* to be the administration of a sacrament. In the Council of Elvira, which was held before that of Nice, the 32nd canon reads thus: "It pleased the fathers that if any one should fall into a deadly sin, he should do penance rather before the bishop than before a priest," which can only mean that the Spanish prelates wished public and very grave crimes to be referred to the bishop, while hidden ones, which did not call for public penance, should be confessed to, and absolved by, the priest. The history of the Novatian schism in the 3d century also shows that private confession was in use at that time. The doctrine of the Novatians is well expressed by Chrysostom (1) in the words he puts into their mouths: "It is not for thee to give the Eucharist to those who have sinned, for there is no other remission" (than by baptism). That is, the Novatians held that since the Eucharist could only be received by the innocent of sin, the fallen (into idolatry, under Decius) could not receive it, for there was no way of recovering their baptismal innocence. The whole controversy, therefore, was as to whether Christ had left to His Church any sacrament, other than baptism, for the remission of sin. The fathers of the council held at Rome in the year 254 declared that the "fallen," when penitent, were to be forgiven. The mere

(1) *Comment on Epist. Heb.*, c. 10.

standing in penance for a time could not bring about their reconciliation, except as a preparation for the sacrament, to be received at the end of the probation. Again, it is certain that the quality and length of the public penance depended entirely upon the judgment given by the confessor; nay, it depended upon him as to whether or not there should be any public penance. As Origen said, in the passage just quoted, the confessor had to judge whether "the trouble should be exposed and cured in an assembly of the whole church," and that judgment could be delivered only after private confession.

The opponents of auricular confession contrive to draw considerable comfort from a famous fact in the life of Nectarius of Constantinople, who succeeded St. Gregory of Nazianzen in that see, in the year 389. This bishop, they say, abolished in his diocese the practice of private confession, and was not therefore condemned; this shows that the custom was derived from human, not divine institution. Premising that a note should be taken of this objection as an admission that the practice was in vogue in the 4th century, we narrate the fact in the words of Socrates, book 5, c. 19, "About this time, it pleased (the authorities) to abolish the priests of the churches who managed penance, and for this cause. After the Novatians had separated from the Church, because they would not communicate with those who had fallen in the Decian persecution, from that time the bishops added to the church rolls a penitentiary priest, in order that those who, after baptism, had fallen, might confess their sins to a priest appointed for that purpose. . . . When this institution had been in vogue a long time, it was at length abolished, in the time of bishop Nectarius, on account of a certain crime committed in the church. A certain noble woman had approached the penitentiary priest, and confessed the sins committed by her since her baptism. The priest ordered the woman to fast and pray frequently, which actions, taken together with her confession of her sins, would constitute a work befitting penitence. In the course of time, the woman confessed another crime, that a deacon of the church had committed fornication with her.

---

When she had said this, the deacon was ejected from the church, and the people were greatly moved; not only on account of the crime committed were they indignant, but because of the infamy and heavy stain put by this fact upon the Church. When, therefore, on account of this thing, reproaches were heaped upon churchmen, Eudaemon, a priest, and Alexandrian by birth, persuaded bishop Nectarius to do away with the penitentiary priest, and to allow every one, as he might wish, and for his own conscience, to approach the communion of the sacraments." Besides confirming the above narration, Sozomenus, book 7, c. 16, says: "Since, in seeking pardon of sin, one must necessarily confess it, it rightly, and from the beginning, seemed to the priests grave and annoying to have to divulge one's crimes, as in a theatre, before the multitude. Therefore they assigned to this office one of the priests who was noted for integrity of life, and who was endowed with taciturnity and prudence, in order that those who had sinned might confess their acts to him. Then, according to each one's fault, what each should do or suffer, he indicated by way of penance, absolved them confessing, each one to exact of himself the punishment of his crime." If we carefully peruse this narrative, we shall see that Nectarius abolished, not sacramental and private, but public confession. For it is plainly stated that he did away with that office which was established at the time of the Novatian schism, which office was no other than of superintending public penance. Again, Nectarius abolished that which was causing scandal. This was, not the betrayal of the woman's crime by the priest who had heard it in the confessional, for neither the words of Socrates bear that interpretation, nor does the testimony of Sozomenus, showing how the selection of the penitentiary was from among those noted for "integrity, taciturnity, and prudence." The occasion of scandal was, and our opponents admit this, the open avowal, on the part of the woman, of her criminal intercourse with the deacon. Nectarius therefore abolished the practice which sometimes obtained, as we have already seen, of publicly confessing certain crimes, according as the permission of the confessor and the fervor

of the penitent dictated. That Socrates understood public confession to be the subject matter of the abrogation is plain from the remark which he says he made to Eudaemon, the instigator of the decree: "Whether or not thy advice will profit the Church, priest, God knows. For my part, I see that to each one is now given a pretext for no longer stirring up his neighbor on account of his sins, and for not observing that precept of the Apostle which tells us not to communicate with the barren works of darkness, but to rather reprove them."

---

## CHAPTER XV.

### ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN RITES AND CEREMONIES.

Among the many changes produced by the spread of Christianity, that upon the arts is not the least notable, and the first effect upon art was a re-establishment of the sublime. A propensity towards the sublime as an æsthetic element, modified by the Mosaic and Christian dogma of Creation, and by the consequent retirement of Eastern emanatism, is observed in the authors of the New Testament, and conspicuously in the writings of Sts. Paul and John. And although it was reserved for later days to witness the maturation of the sublime in the pre-eminently Catholic Dante, and for still more modern times to be blessed by the adult genius of a Michel Angelo, we cannot arise from the perusal of Tertullian, Cyprian, or any of the early fathers, without feeling that their souls were afire with preternatural eloquence prompted by meditation upon the four great types of Christian art, the God-Man, the Virgin Mother, the Angel, and the Saint. These four subjects are ever present to the Christian, and it is natural to him to externate the ideas born in his soul, now by painting, now by sculpture, now by music, now by ritual. All religionists, of course, in a greater or less degree, experience this tendency, and in

accordance with their approach to truth in the conception of divine things, do they arise to the sublime, or sink to the commonplace—mayhap, to the deformed, in their artistic manifestations. Influenced by her four great types of art, the Church banished from the portals of the sublime the deformities of Oriental symbolism, substituting therefor an emblematicism which was simple at once and dignified. It was only when the days of open persecution had been for a while shortened, that the world found that she who claimed its mastery in the spheres of religion was also its mistress in the domains of art. But even when she lurked in the bowels of the earth, there moved within her the instinct to present to the eyes and ears of her children the beautiful ideas of eternal truth with which she glowed. The damp and bare walls of her subterranean churches were utilized, the slabs of her martyrs' graves were adorned, and the faithful could see around them pictorial illustrations of the doctrines they believed. Through the long and gloomy corridors of the Catacombs, on stated occasions, there wended its pious way a torch-lighted procession of clergy and of virgins, chanting the praises of the Lord and His saints. Arrived at the chapel designed for the service of the day, the Pontiff seats himself on his throne, cut in the solid rock, and by his attendant deacons is vested in habiliments each one of which has a deep and liturgical meaning. For he is about to offer up to God that Eucharistic Sacrifice of the Lamb of God which is the centre of all Catholic ritual, and it is the aim of the Church that her ritual shall be instructive of doctrine even in its minute details. Here too, then, just as, when circumstances shall permit, she will avail herself of architecture and sculpture as a means of instruction, does she seek in her ceremonies to impress truth upon the minds of men. The awful and majestic rite is begun, and after a series of prayers and ceremonies—all excitant of faith and devotion in the bystanders—it is consummated amid the tears of many who will never participate in it again. They will soon receive the martyr's crown, and among the causes which, under God's grace, will have contributed to the enlightenment of their

understanding and to the strengthening of their wills, will be those very ceremonies which the Church has used for their edification.

And now for the object of this chapter. That the rites of the Church are deeply impressive, many outsiders admit; that some of them are eminently beautiful, all agree; why and how and when they originated, is a matter of dispute. It is not within the province of the historian to illustrate the meaning of the Church's liturgy, but it is his office to investigate a charge of unworthy origin brought against her rites. Of such a nature is the accusation put forth by Mosheim, one of the most worthy, as he is about the most impartial of our opponents in the historical order. This author, when treating of the third century, reduces the origin of Christian rites to the following causes. The primitive worship of Christians was distinguished by simplicity; in fact, it was so void of ritualistic tendencies, that it seemed to the Pagan mind to even ignore the existence of God. To avert, therefore, the charge of atheism, the Christians introduced external paraphernalia of which the Pagans were fond. Again, among the apparatus of the Greek and Oriental worship, the chief respect was paid to the *mysteries*: to draw, therefore, the Gentiles more easily away from the temples, our forefathers in the faith introduced their mysteries and sacred rites. To these alleged causes, which in last analysis are based upon a mere "perhaps," and might, therefore, be dismissed by a "perhaps not," Mosheim assigns a more specious one. "To these causes, add the study of the Platonic philosophy, or, if you prefer, the popular superstition of the Orientals about demons, which the Platonists had made their own, and which the Christian teachers had received from these latter. From this opinion as to the nature and propensities of the genii, the origin of many rites is to be sought. This idea called forth public exorcisms, frequent fasts, the avoidance of marriage. This idea dissuaded companionship with those not yet admitted to the sacred font, or with those who were excluded from communion in divine things, since all such were regarded as subject to the dominion of some evil genius. This idea, to say nothing of other

effects, increased the annoyances and punishments generally imposed upon sinners" (1). And in another place (2), "The Christian bishops slightly changed the institutions and rites with which the Romans, Greeks, and other people showed their devotion and reverence towards the false gods, and introduced them into Christian worship, and therefore at that time there was but little difference between the public religions of Romans, Greeks, and Christians. All possessed showy vestments, mitres, tiaras, wax torches, trumpets, supplications, purifications, golden and silver vases, &c." Let us now examine these causes which Mosheim assigns as an origin of our Catholic rites and ceremonies. Firstly, as to the desire of the clergy to attract the Greeks and Romans who were used to *mysteries*. Were such a reason given for the present use in this city of New York of a certain pomp and ceremonial, supposing of course that they were of late introduction, it would not lack a certain speciousness, although it would be little complimentary to the intellectual calibre of our Protestant friends, and would display very little confidence in their religious sincerity. But when it is assigned to the third century as a motive of Christian action, we are asked to believe too much. At that time the Church was in hiding. Of what use to the object in view would have been the introduction of rites when the Pagans were excluded, not merely from the spectacle, but in most cases even from a knowledge of the place where it was given? Is it not more logical to admit that as the Church ever taught that God was to be adored in external worship, as well as by internal obsequiousness, so she furnished her children with the means of fulfilling the obligation? And this, from the very nature of her doctrine, she was compelled to do, so far as circumstances would permit, even though there had been no calumny as to her atheism.

Puerile, indeed, is the charge of imitation in the matter of mysteries. Mosheim could scarcely have intended to descend to a play upon words when dealing with so important a matter. And yet, outside of the mere verbal analogy, there is no similarity between the Pagan mysteries and

(1) *History*, p. 2, c. 4.(2) *Ibid.*, *hist. Cent.* 4, c. 4.

the hidden dogmas and sacred rites of the Christians. In what were these like unto the Eleusinia, the Thyestea, or the Lupercalia? But rooted deeply into the Christian religion there were certain heads of doctrine, real mysteries, so called because they were too sublime for the caption of human understanding. No need had the Christian pastors to go outside of their own communion for what they had within in such abundance; no need to go to the decrepit and sensual systems of Paganism for what the Redeemer had given them in all purity and sanctity.

Of no greater weight is the assertion based upon the affection of many of the early fathers for the philosophy of Plato. Deep indeed and all-powerful would that affection have been, and weak indeed their respect for Christianity, if the Neo-Platonist fathers had been led to so radically vitiate the faith as Mosheim supposes. But the theory of demonology as understood by the Church, and with her by these Neo-Platonists, was far different from the superstition of genii, &c., encouraged by ancient Paganism and modern Mohammedanism. Her exorcisms, &c., are based upon her own theory derived from her Founder, and of the truth of which both the Old and New Testament furnish abundant proof. As for the frequency of fasts having any connection with the Platonic philosophy, we are at a loss to account for it, as all Pagans extolled the system of Lucullus as above that of the Baptist. But there is a way of accounting for the introduction of any rational system of mortification into the Christian discipline, if we reflect upon the example and teaching of Christ. As for avoidance of matrimony, the idea of which Mosheim derives from the Platonic affiliations of the early Christians, the veriest tyro in sacred science knows that the Church holds marriage to be a sacrament, and therefore holy, but that, with St. Paul, she teaches that in particular cases the celibitic state is preferable. Nor is there any Platonic sympathy displayed in the discontinuance of association with the excommunicated, which the ancient discipline so rigidly inculcated; it is rather in accordance with the command of St. Paul whereby we were not even to give the compliment of salute to a heretic.

The entire theory of Mosheim in this matter is based upon the supposition that because there exists a similarity between the Christian rites and those of Paganism, therefore the more modern system drew such institutions from the other. "Similitudes are not to be urged in all points" is a very good maxim, but the points of assumed similarity should at least be tangible, and not merely fancied. Now there is no more likeness between the rites of Catholicism and those of Paganism as practised in Rome, Greece, and Egypt, especially when we consider the symbolic meaning of the ceremonies, than exists between them and those which were once in vogue in the temples of the Montezumas. And even if we discovered a well-founded similarity, we could not logically infer a connection, if there were other ways of accounting for the origin. Palma (1), in treating of this subject, presents Mosheim as very neatly undermining his own position in another part of his works (2), where he expressly contends that because similarities are found between the Christian and Jewish customs, it by no means follows that the Church modelled her discipline upon the form of that of the Synagogue. "I easily believe," says Mosheim, "that the Christians established many customs which were in use in the Jewish assemblies, and that therefore it would not be rash to say that the Church is similar to the Synagogue. But this similarity by no means shows that the Christians took from the Jews those things which are like in form to the Jewish worship. For since the same end was proposed by the Jews and Christians in frequenting their houses of worship, it could not but necessarily happen that sometimes the Christians would do the same things as the Jews did. . . . the divine law was to be publicly promulgated, and explained; the people were to be excited by sermons and exhortations, and to be taught; hymns were to be sung and prayers recited. For no religious assemblage, convened for divine worship, can lack these things. . . . The nature of things demanded these institutions, without which religion could not subsist; not, how-

(1) *Hist. Eccl.*, c. 33.(2) *Inst. Hist. Maj.*, *sec.* 1, p. 2, § 9.

ever, the desire, which they are said to have had, of imitating the Jews."

Several Catholic writers assign a Pagan origin to many of our rites, though not prompted by the spirit of contempt which actuated Calvin, the Centuriators of Magdeburg, Conyers Middleton, Buddeus, Mosheim, &c. Among such we regret to notice Gerson, Raynaud, Petau, Noel Alexandre. But all rely upon the similarity which they find between the Christian and Pagan rites, which argument, as we have seen, is not conclusive. As well might it be said that since both Pagans and Christians eat and drink, live under roofs, and cover their bodies, therefore the latter do so in imitation of the former. There are some things which men are impelled by nature to do, and in which they need no teacher. Just so, many of the sacred ceremonies come into use instinctively, without any example being necessary from the more ancient religions. Thus nature prompts men to use for the honor of God those things of earth which seem to speak of goodness, of purity, and of glory. Hence in nearly all religions the use of flowers and lights. Even Puritanism sought, for a time, to manifest by external signs the spirit of its doctrine. The very simplicity of its worship, the barrenness of its temples, the primness of countenance and severity of costume of its followers, all were so many ritualistic expressions of the sombreness of the Deity it adored. On the contrary, the Catholic religion, being pre-eminently one of joy, of love, and of filial confidence, in a God who had given so many and such proofs of love to man, naturally sought to express its feelings by the use of everything in nature and in art which, otherwise legitimate, might enhance the devotion of its children. Nature, and not Paganism, was its teacher. There are certain passages of Gregory of Nyssa and of Theodoret (1) which seem to give weight to the theory of our opponents. But they only go to show that as the Pagans on certain days celebrated the memory of their gods and heroes, so the Christians assigned other days to the memory of the saints. The same might be alleged of tem-

(1) BARONIO, *year 44, num. 86.*

ples, but no one contends that we owe to Pagans the idea of a place of worship. The origin of saints' days flows naturally from the Catholic dogma of their veneration, and traces of such may be found in the Old Testament, without recurring to Gentile sources. But granted that the Church wished to substitute her own feasts for those of the Pagan world, wherein is strengthened the theory we combat? Some ancient fathers (1), commenting upon the words of St. Paul, *Gal.*, 4, 10, "You observe days and months, &c.," ask themselves whether the Christians imitated the Jews in the establishment of feast-days, and answer with a denial, because of the diversity of end proposed in each case. St. Jerome says (2), "We do not celebrate the Pasch of the unleavened, but of the resurrection and the cross; nor have we, according to the rule of Israel, seven weeks in Pentecost, but we venerate the advent of the Holy Ghost." The same father answers our opponents, when he says to Vigilantius, "That was done for the idols, and is therefore detestable; this is done for the martyrs, and is therefore to be received." And St. Augustine (3), "When these are shown to God, in accordance with His inspiration and teaching, it is true religion; but when to the demons, in accordance with their impious pride, it is a baneful superstition.

It may be interesting to notice some of the rites which we are said to have derived from the Pagans. We shall confine ourselves to those which in themselves are the most important, or which have been placed in this category by authors of celebrity (4). The pious Gerson so insists as to the Purification of the Blessed Virgin (5), the ancient Romans being accustomed to carry candles in honor of a certain goddess, and in the purification of the city. The learned Erasmus, Melancthon, and Gravati, derive the Christian idea of excommunication from the same source. Polydorus Vergilius thus treats the constitution of our hierarchy and our ecclesiastical polity; especially our cus-

(1) ORIGEN, *Ag. Celsus*, B. 8. CHRYSOSTOM, *hom.* 63.

(2) *Ad. Apost. loc.*

(3) *Ep.* 49, *al.* 102, *qu.* 3, n. 18.

(4) The reader who is anxious for more information will find an abundance in the valuable dissertation of the Jesuit Peter Lazeri, inserted by Zaccaria in his Latin edition of Fleury's *Discipline of God's People*, published at Venice in 1782.

(5) *Tom. III.*, p. 474.

tom of kissing the foot of the Supreme Pontiff and the hand of a bishop ; also, the "*Ite, missa est*" at the end of Mass. Buddeus classes together our Canonization of Saints and the Gentile *apotheosis* of heroes. Angelo Rocca gives a Pagan origin to our prayers for the dead. Raynaud (1), does the same with vigils, the placing of holy water at the doors of churches, Rogation Days, the prohibition of marriage at certain periods. Now of all these instances of an apparently Pagan origin on the part of our rites, there is not one to which, with more probability of accuracy, should not be assigned as source one of the following : either nature, of which we have already spoken ; the institutes of the Jews ; the words of the Scriptures ; or Catholic dogma as naturally calling for it. And here again we must insist upon the weakness of an argument drawn from a similarity of rites. If such a reasoning were permissible, then we ought to style even the Sacrament of Baptism an imitation from Paganism. For, as Tertullian says of the devil (2), "He also immerses some, and promises his believers and faithful ones an expiation from the font," and to extend the parallel to matters of which Christ is certainly the Author, "the devil also celebrates the offering of bread, and has his virgins and his continent ones."

Those who assign a Pagan origin to a single one of the Christian rites must lay aside any acquaintance with the feelings of our ancestors in the faith towards the Gentiles. It is no exaggeration to say that they held the Pagan system in utter execration, and that they harbored a holy fear lest by any contact with anything belonging to the pest, they should contract some deadly evil. How then are we to suppose that they would willingly incorporate into their very economy of worship, the rites of the priests of Baal ? Again, we know that of old the fathers had to bear the reproach of having no temples, no images, no altars ; that Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Athenagoras, Minutius, Arnobius, Lactantius, all seem to concede the truth of the accusation. Did they really possess no temples before the year 230, as Tillemont contends, and no images, as Petau and Noel

(1) *Heterocl. Spirit.* part 1, p. 109.(2) *De Praescript.*, c. 41.

Alexandre hold? Then why did they not have those things which so soon afterwards came to be regarded as useful to the service of God? It must have been because they wished to have nothing in common with the Gentiles, whose temples, altars, and sculptured ornaments were everywhere visible. As Petau rightly observes (1), "Since as yet the Pagan superstition was navigating under full sail, in those first days of the Church, it was deemed better to suppress and omit many things, which were in themselves not useless and even proper; for there was danger lest the parade of certain rites would give offence, bearing, as they did, some similarity to those in use by the Pagans." If this be so, can we believe that the fathers deliberately adopted the Gentile ceremonies? And how stands the case if we partly differ from Petau, and hold that in many churches the use of images was known? How is it, if we hold with Medus and Bingham that temples existed before the year 230? And how, when it is contended that the existence of altars flows necessarily from the Catholic dogma of the Eucharistic Sacrifice? Surely in this supposition, there must be some way of accounting for the silence of the fathers when accused of having neither temples, altars, or images. Bona (2) thinks it was because the sanctuaries of the Christians were hidden and modest. Petau holds that they were silent as to the altars because these were temporary, not permanent. Noel Alexandre (3) finds a reason in the repugnance of the early Christians to the theory of the Pagans that an image, when consecrated, became the god himself (4). We can only believe, in the supposition that the fathers were possessed of temples and images (of altars there can be no doubt), that so profound was their detestation of everything Gentile, they wished, as far as possible, to remove from their rites every similarity to those of the hated superstition. We cannot therefore suppose them guilty of the adoption of Pagan ceremonies.

(1) *Incarnation*, b. 15. c. 13, No. 3.(2) *Liturgy*, b. 1, c. 19.(3) *Cent. VIII.*, diss. 6.(4) MINUTIUS FELIX in *Octav.*

## CHAPTER XVI.

## JULIAN THE APOSTATE.

Flavius Claudius Julianus, nephew of Constantine the Great, was born in the year 331. Although baptized and educated as a Christian, he became a Pagan when quite young, but kept the perversion a secret. Constantius II. was very suspicious of him, and often imprisoned him, but in the year 355, he proclaimed him Cæsar, and gave him the hand of his sister Helena. Having defeated the German invaders of Gaul, and driven them across the Rhine, Julian became the idol of the soldiery, and when, in 360, Constantius ordered him to send his best troops for a campaign against Persia, they proclaimed him emperor. He was marching on the capital, when the death of Constantius left him undisputed master of the empire. It was only then that he openly avowed his abandonment of Christianity, and entered upon a course of persecution. But his system was quite different from that adopted by the olden Pagan emperors; he aimed rather at undermining Christianity than at openly persecuting its votaries. He did not compel people to sacrifice to the gods; he rather enticed them to do so. Thus, he ordered his statue to be surrounded by images of the gods; then the Christians found themselves in a dilemma. If they paid it any sign of respect, the homage was regarded by him and his partisans as given also to the idols; if they refused the token, they could be held for treason. On one occasion, some soldiers had burnt incense before the imperial image, in gratitude for a gift of pocket-money. When they discovered what was then imputed to them, they rushed to the palace, and before the eyes of Julian, they flung the coins out of the windows, protesting themselves Christians, and ready, if necessary, for martyrdom. The enraged emperor ordered them to be beheaded, but, recovering his usual subtlety, and envying them such glory, he commuted the sentence to exile. Another means of annoying the faithful, and of corrupting the integrity of

the weak-minded—one which has proved, in modern times, far more successful than bloody persecution—was adopted by the imperial philosophaster. Under the reigns of the late emperors the Christians had arisen to the highest posts of the state, both civil and military, and in the great republic of letters, they had shone with a glory which far surpassed that of their Pagan compeers. We do not read that he entirely forbade the army to the faithful—their prowess was as serviceable to the state in those days as it is in more modern times—but the higher posts were to be opened to them no longer. They were to be shut out also from the great world of literature; probably he hoped to be able one day to reproach them with their ignorance, as more modern persecutors have done in the case of their victims. He promulgated a law, in accordance with which, the children of Christians could receive no academic education. Upon the consequences of such a law, no comment is necessary; the reader's acquaintance with modern English and Irish history is sufficient to enable him to form a correct opinion upon them. If Julian thus looked forward to the mental degradation of future generations, it is not surprising that he at once interdicted to Christians all entrance into the judiciary, or even the bar. But he was not content with these open attacks upon the faith; he descended to puerilities, which, even if successful, could have had no effect upon the victims. Thus, he ordered the food, exposed for sale in the markets of Constantinople, to be mixed with that which had been offered to the idols. When the faithful discovered the fraud, they subsisted as best they could on what they had at home, and Julian, probably fearing the market-women, put a stop to the trick. At Antioch, his agents poured the "water of purification" (*aqua lustralis*) from the temples into all the wells, but the Christians used the wells, remembering perforce the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. 10, "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, eat, asking no questions for conscience's sake."

Julian was also guilty of violent acts of insult to Christianity. At Antioch, he broke into the magnificent basilica constructed by his uncle, urinated on the altar, and carried

the Sacramental vessels to his treasury. He ordered the worship of Apollo to be revived in the wood of Daphne, wherein reposed the relics of the martyr-bishop of Antioch, Babyla, and the people solemnly transferred the body to the city, singing, with the Psalmist, confusion to all the adorers of idols. He threw down the statue at Cæsarea Philippi, which had been erected to Christ by the woman cured of a bloody flow, and put up one of himself (1). Although Julian preferred to use insidious rather than aggressive means for the overthrow of Christianity, there were several martyrdoms during his reign. Publia, an abbess, Juventin, Maximin, and Artimius, are mentioned by Theodoret as dying for the faith. If not by his order, at least with the connivance of Julian, the Pagans of Ascalon ripped open the bowels of many priests and nuns, and filling them with grain, threw the mutilated and quivering frames to hogs to be devoured. At Arethusa, the bishop, Mark (2) who had once saved the life of Julian, was subjected to many and grievous vexations. The regard which Julian had for the lives of his Christian subjects, and for his own laws of toleration, may be known from his having exiled a Pagan prefect who had presumed to upbraid some other Pagans for killing some Christians. The apostate tried hard to win over Sts. Basil and Gregory of Nazianzen, and made the latter's brother, Cæsarius, prefect of the imperial treasury. But the two saints spurned all bribes and solicitations for themselves, and influenced Cæsarius to do likewise. It is notable that although Julian affected a profound contempt for Christians, whom he designated as "Galileans," yet he never ceased to propose their purity as a model to his Pagan priests.

The most important event of Julian's reign was the attempted restoration of the great temple at Jerusalem, in order to falsify the prediction of our Lord. About 300 years had passed since the destruction of the temple by

(1) Sozomenus relates that the statue of Julian was immediately struck by lightning, and demolished. The people collected the fragments of the statue of our Lord, and reverently placed them in the main church.

(2) Mark was at one time an Arian, but he must at this time have again become orthodox, for St. Gregory of Nazianzen and Theodoret are strong in his praise, when speaking of this part of his life.

Titus, when the apostate, aided by the Jews, set about his task. But all his efforts only served to further verify the prophecy of Christ. We shall take occasion to speak more fully of this matter at the close of our dissertation. Although the destruction of Christianity was the main object of Julian's reign, he was compelled by exigencies of state to pause in his work in the year 363. The war with Persia claimed his attention; therefore, swearing to finish the ruin of the Church on his return, he made his preparatory sacrifices to the gods, and set out on what proved his last campaign. With his usual intrepidity, he was leading a charge, in the very first battle, when he was mortally wounded by an arrow. According to Theodoret and St. Gregory of Nazianzen, he threw some of his blood towards Heaven, crying, "Galilean, Thou hast conquered." Ammianus Marcellinus says nothing of this incident, but his silence casts <sup>no</sup> improbability upon the story. Nazianzen knew Julian thoroughly, having studied with him at Athens, and been on terms of intimacy with him, and he certainly deemed the bitter words consonant with the character of the dying man. And it is natural that Ammianus, a Pagan, should have hesitated to report this avowal of defeat on the part of his hero, especially since the Pagans had just been flattering themselves on the approaching ruin of the Christian religion, for the edict of persecution had already been sent into Africa. The last moments of Julian were spent in an interview with Maximus, a philosopher and magician, to whose influence was due, more than to anything else, his apostasy. This "philosopher" had involved the ardent young man, when a student of 24 years of age, in the mysteries of astrology: he attached him to himself by flattering his ambition, and prognosticating for him a universal empire. Leading him to believe in the theory of metempsychosis, he persuaded him that the soul of Alexander the Great resided in his body; hence, perhaps, much of his rash intrepidity in battle, and hence, certainly, much of his love of Paganism. When Julian died, he was only 32 years of age.

Since the character of Julian was a mass of contradictions, it is not strange that writers have formed upon him very

different judgments. Chastellux, the author of the treatise on "Public Happiness," says of him, "Sometimes Julian essays to copy Marcus Aurelius, sometimes Trajan, and again Alexander. His works are those of a sophist and of a rhetorician. In his habits, he is a Stoic; in the temple he is an idolater, and in his cabinet, a bad Platonist, seeking to corrupt the doctrines of that sect by an unworthy alliance with magic." The following portrait, drawn by St. Gregory of Nazianzen, is as interesting as it is reliable: "Most persons only knew Julian after he made himself known by his actions, and by his abuse of absolute power; but I knew him from the time of our acquaintance at Athens, and I never found a sign of good in him. He ever rolled his eyes from side to side, and had a ferocious aspect. He could not keep his limbs at rest, he was continually distending and contracting his nostrils, in sign of anger or of contempt, and he was constantly addicted to sharp sayings and cool buffooneries. His laugh was a bellow. He would at the same moment grant or refuse a favor with equal ease, talked without rhyme or reason, put inopportune questions, and gave answers far from the point. But why do I enter into such detail as to his exterior? . . . . . those who were with us (at Athens) can witness, that, when I noted his characteristics, I said that the Roman state was nourishing a very dangerous serpent. So I said, hoping, at the same time, that I was deceived; and without doubt, it were better that I had been, and the earth not been desolated by so many evils." Le Beau, in his *History of the Lower Empire*, thus speaks of Julian: "We can perceive in his soul every play of vanity. As greedy of glory as the miser is of riches, he seeks it in the smallest of objects. His temperance is pushed to extremes, and becomes a theatrical virtue. A great portion of his subjects never received any justice from him; had he truly been the father of his people, he would have ceased to hate the Christians, and would not have made war upon them from the moment he became their emperor. He spared their lives only in his words and edicts. Julian is the model for such persecuting rulers as wish to escape reproach by an appearance of sweetness and

equity." From what has been said, it can be readily seen that the Christians of his day had some excuse for identifying Julian with the persecutor mentioned in an enigmatical manner in the 13th chapter of the *Apocalypse* (1).

We now come to the principal event in the life of Julian, his failure in the attempted rebuilding of the temple of Jerusalem. The apologists of Christianity have always drawn an argument to prove its divinity, from its miracles and from the fulfilment of the prophecies connected with it. To this latter class belongs the argument deduced from the destruction of the Jewish temple by Titus. It came to the mind of Julian that by rebuilding this temple, he would render void the prophecy of Christ, and thus shake the Christian system to the core. But God ordained that he was not to succeed. All that money could produce was at hand, the Jews flocked from all parts to aid in the work, and in a short time the new foundations were well under way. But suddenly, there burst from the bosom of the earth a sea of fire, which drove the workmen from their labor, and consumed all the preparations for the task. The reality of this event is impugned by many Protestant authors, and by all the foes of the miraculous. It is for us to show that our reasons for believing the above to be an incontestable fact of history, are solid and convincing. And first, we have the testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus (d. 395), a Pagan, a courtier and admirer of Julian, and a fellow-soldier, who, speaking of Julian's widespread activity, says that, "wishing to perpetuate the memory of his reign by the magnitude of his works, he thought to restore, at an immense outlay, a certain magnificent temple at Jerusalem, which, after many destructive combats during a siege by Vespasian and Titus, had with difficulty been captured; and he assigned the task to Alypius of Antioch, a former pro-prefect of Britain. While, therefore, Alypius was energetically pushing the affair forward, with the assistance of the rector of the province, there burst forth, at the foundations, fearful masses of flames, which, by their frequent

(1) The Abbé Baudouin, in an explanation of the *Apocalypse*, published at Paris, in 1784, contends that the Greek term *apostates*, now Julian's distinctive surname, gives exactly the number 666, according to the numerical value of the letters, as assigned by the Greeks.

assaults, rendered the place inaccessible, burning up the laborers as often as any approached. In this manner, the element obstinately repelling them, an end was made to the design."

Is it likely that a man in the position of Marcellinus would have published a fact so triumphant for the Christians, had he been in the slightest doubt as to its truth? Again, St. Cyril was almost on the spot at the time, for he was then bishop of Jerusalem. Socrates (1) says of him, "At that time, Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, mindful of the prophecy of Daniel, which Christ confirmed in the Holy Gospels, plainly predicted to many hearers that, in a short time, not one stone above another should remain of that temple, and thus would the oracle of the Saviour be fulfilled." Socrates is confirmed by Rufinus. This passage shows us that the Christians of the Holy City fully appreciated the motives of Julian, and when Socrates speaks of the prediction of St. Cyril, he plainly proves that, a short time after it, must have occurred some event which, by destroying what had remained of the ancient foundations of the temple, fulfilled the Biblical prophecy. Another testimony to the truth of this miracle is found in St. Ambrose's reprimand to Theodosius for wishing to compel Christians to rebuild a Pagan temple. "Hast thou not heard, O emperor," he said (2), "that when Julian ordered the temple of Jerusalem to be rebuilt, those who were doing the work were burnt by divine fire? Dost thou not beware, lest it may do so now?" and St. John Chrysostom, speaking of the miracle, says (3), "The emperor Julian, although he was so madly devoted to the design, yet feared, that if he proceeded any further therein, the fire would descend upon his own head; and, with all his people, he ceased from the work. And now if you go to Jerusalem, you will see the bare foundations, and if you ask the reason, you will hear only this: 'We are all witnesses to this thing; in our day, only a little while ago, it happened; reflect upon the wonderful victory. This did not occur under the pious Cæsars,

(1) *History*, b. 3, c. 20.

(2) *Epist.* 11, to *Theodosius*.

(3) *Oration against Jews and Gentiles*.

lest some might say that the Christians' coming had perfected the work ; but it happened when we were in affliction, when all liberty was withdrawn, when Paganism flourished, when the faithful were either hiding at home or had fled into the solitudes and avoided the open places. It happened, in fine, so that there would be left no pretext to impudence.' " Looking over these testimonies of Sts. Cyril, Chrysostom, and Ambrose, we cannot perceive in them any lack of weight with which a candid mind would find fault, or any innate weakness which the rules of criticism can discover. St. Cyril was a man of cool judgment, and was thoroughly cognizant of the aspirations and acts of Julian ; he was the Christian leader in Jerusalem at the time of the attempted restoration of the temple ; and, finally, there was no reason for Socrates' introduction of his prediction unless it was well known by all that the prediction was connected with some act which fulfilled it. That act is accounted for in the supposition of the truth of the miracle in question ; it remains unknown, and therefore Socrates was guilty of holding up Cyril as a false prophet, if we set the miracle aside. St. Chrysostom exhibits too much confidence in his remarks to a people who must have been well informed on the subject of his discourse, for us to suppose him in error. The same holds good of St. Ambrose in his rebuke of Theodosius. We have already alluded to St. Gregory Nazianzen, as a valuable authority for anything connected with the reign of Julian.

The following testimony, taken from his 4th *Oration* against the apostate, fully confirms that of Marcellinus : " Julian pitted the Jews against us. He availed himself of their ancient fickleness and of their intense hatred for us, to perfect his design ; asserting that, according to their books and traditions, they were destined to return to their own land, and to renew their ancestral rites. . . . Those who have studied their doings narrate how their wives not only stripped themselves of all their ornaments and matronal insignia, that they might contribute to the reconstruction of the building, but even carried earth in their bosoms, sparing neither their exquisite robes nor their delicate

frames in what they deemed a work of piety—regarding all else as subordinate to this enterprise. When, however, forced by a dire confusion and by a sudden tremor of the undulating ground, they rushed to a neighboring temple to pray and to escape the danger, . . . they found, according to some, the doors suddenly closed and bolted by an invisible power. . . . One thing certainly all do narrate, and hold for certain, that when they were striving by main force to secure an entrance, a fire burst forth out of the temple, and consumed some of them entirely, and destroyed the principal limbs of others. . . . But more wonderful yet, and significant, a light shone forth in the heavens, and forming a cross over the earth, showed to all alike that name and that figure which were once held in contempt. Even now, those who were witnesses of this miracle show their garments burnt by the sign of the cross.”

It is difficult for the incredulous to institute any positive argumentation against the truth of this miracle. Preconceived opinions and violent religious prejudice may give birth to conjectures, but they are none of them even plausible when compared with the positive testimonies we possess in its favor. About the strongest of the negative arguments which can be adduced against it is offered by Basnage (1). St. Cyril, he says, who was bishop of Jerusalem at the time of the alleged miracle, and predicted, according to Socrates, that the prophecy of Christ was soon to be fulfilled, has nevertheless nowhere given us any account of this important event. This argument, though weak, might be of some weight, could its author show that any of the works of St. Cyril, which we possess, were written after the attempted restoration of the temple. But this cannot be proved; nay, that all of the works of St. Cyril, which have come down to us, were composed before the event in question, is conceded by the erudite in such matters. Thus, the *Catechisms* belong to the year 347; the *Epistle to Constantius* to the year 351. These are all the works of St. Cyril that we have, for the epistle to St. Augustine on the *Miracles of St. Jerome*, which is found in the works of the

(1) *History of the Jews*, b. 6, c. 18.

great doctor, is manifestly a forgery, as is shown by its own absurdities, and by the fact that St. Cyril died thirty years before St. Jerome. Basnage relies considerably upon the discrepancies between the narrations of the miracle as given by Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoret. But the diversities are merely in accidentals, not in essentials, and just as in the case of the gospels, so in purely historical matters, accidental variations of authors, if united with concord in essentials, are no justification for their being rejected.

---

## CHAPTER XVII.

### THE DONATIST HERESY, AND THE JUDGMENT OF POPE MELCHIADES.

In the year 311, a certain Spanish woman named Lucilla, living at Carthage in Africa, was observed to kiss, with superstitious veneration, the bones of a man, who, though probably a martyr, had not been formally recognized as such by the ecclesiastical authorities. Being reproved by Cæcilian, the Archdeacon of Carthage, her religious devotion proved less strong than her vanity, and she bided her time for revenge. About this time Mensurius, bishop of Carthage, having been called to Rome by Maxentius to answer the charge of hiding a deacon who had written against the tyrant, was removed by death, and Cæcilian was elected to his place. Before his departure for Rome, Mensurius had consigned the sacred vessels to the care of certain seniors of the church, and these now refused to obey the requisition for them made by the new bishop. To the vindictive ex-devotee, Lucilla, and the avaricious old stewards of the church, both parties ready for anything which promised the ruin of Cæcilian, was soon given the aid of Botrus and Cælesius, two priests who had each been disappointed in the hope of succeeding Mensurius. This was the origin of the Donatist schism, the fruit of an alliance between feminine ire, avarice, and ambition. But an excuse was want-

ing to the enemies of Cæcilian, and that was soon found. His episcopal consecration had been received at the hands of Felix, bishop of Aptonga, who was accused of being one of those unfortunates who, in the time of persecution, had given up the gospels to the enemies of Christianity. Therefore, the factious contended, the consecration of Cæcilian was null and void. They also asserted that, during the persecutions, Cæcilian had prevented food from being carried to certain confessors in prison. Their first step was to procure the deposition of Cæcilian, but to bring that about, they were compelled to fall into a great inconsistency. They invoked the aid of Secundus, primate of Numidia, himself one of the most noted of "traitors," as those were styled who had surrendered the sacred books. This prelate assembled a synod of seventy bishops, "traitors" like himself, but whose sins the money of Lucilla had covered (1). In this pseudo-synod, Cæcilian was condemned, and in his place was thrust Majorinus, a creature of the precious Lucilla. The intruder received consecration from Donatus, bishop of a place called "Black Cottages." "*Casae Nigrae*," and this prelate may be regarded as the prime inciter of the new schism. To another Donatus, however, the new schismatics preferred to give the honor of having named their body; to the one, that is, who succeeded Majorinus in the usurped see of Carthage. The identity of name sometimes caused confusion in the mind of St. Augustine, as he confesses in his *Retractations*, b. 1, c. 21. In spite of the apparent triumph of his enemies, the holy Cæcilian could, as St. Augustine says (2), "care nothing for their conspiring multitude, when he saw himself united by letters of communion with the Roman Church, in which always flourished the principality of the Apostolic Chair." His foes also dreaded the affection of Constantine for their victim, and in order to lessen it, they used their influence with Anulinus, the proconsul of Africa, to have presented to the emperor, then in Gaul, the libel they had composed against the integrity of Cæcilian. They also begged of Constantine that

(1) See ST. AUGUSTINE; *Heresies*, c. 69; *Epist.* 162. Also OPTATUS, against *Parmenian*, b. 1.

(2) *Epistle No.* 162.

he would assign Gallic judges to settle the Carthaginian troubles, "for in Africa there are contentions between us and the other bishops," they added. According to Optatus, when the emperor had read the documents, he angrily cried out, "You ask judgment of me, a secular, who myself expect the judgment of Christ?" However, he wrote to Pope Melchiades asking him to decide the case, and requested three Gallic prelates, Maternus of Cologne, Marmus of Arles, and Rheticius of Autun, to go to Rome to assist the Pontiff. A council was accordingly held in the year 313, in the Lateran palace, then the residence of the empress Fausta, and to it were summoned, besides the three Gallic bishops, fifteen Italians. After a patient hearing of both Cæcilian and Donatus, the synod condemned the latter (him of the "Black Cottages") and declared the former legitimate bishop of Carthage. As for those dioceses in which the Donatist troubles had introduced two rivals for the episcopal chair, it was decreed, for the sake of peace, that priority of consecration should decide each case, "for the other bishop, another flock should be provided." The Donatists again had recourse to secular influence, telling the emperor that the case of Felix of Aptonga, the consecrator of Cæcilian, had not been decided, and that there had been too few bishops in the Roman synod. At this new appeal, says Optatus, Constantine exclaimed, "Such rabid audacity of fury! Just like Gentiles, they put forth an appeal." Thinking he might thus calm the raging schismatics, he now ordered Elianus, the new proconsul, to inquire into the case of Felix, and the result was his acquittal of the charge of "betrayal." But the Donatist fury was by no means assuaged, and at the request of the emperor, another synod was called in the year 314. This council met at Arles, and was attended by two hundred bishops, the Papal legates presiding in the name of the new Pontiff, Sylvester I. (1) Again was the cause of Cæcilian triumphant, but again, with few exceptions, were the Donatists obstinate. From the sentence of the Church they again appealed to Constantine, and

(1) Sirmond and Launoy thought, from the large number of prelates attending this synod, that it was the *plenary council*, the authority of which St. Augustine frequently quotes against the Donatists. That the holy Doctor means the Council of Nice is fully proved by Alexandre.

from this time the emperor vacillated in their regard. While he condemned them in Milan in the year 316, he was finally conquered by the obstinacy which, under the leadership of the "great Donatus" (the intruder of Carthage), they continued to display; and at first content with diminishing the severity of his laws against them, he soon allowed them full liberty. At his death, the government of Africa fell to Constans. Under this emperor, benignity was at first the order of the day towards the Donatists, but when he found them degenerated into worse than highway robbers, carrying fire and sword into the homes, not only of Catholics, but even of their own sect, he made use of the army to restore order. When the schismatic bishops saw the ruin of the armed bands which they had employed, some of them fled, others again were exiled. Among these latter was Donatus of Carthage. Most of the sectarians now returned to the communion of the Church, and during the following reign of Constantius, there was comparative peace in religious matters in Africa. Donatus of Carthage died in the year 350, and his place was filled by Parmenian; St. Cæcilian had died in 348, and to him succeeded Gratus, and then Res-titutus. Under Julian the Apostate, the Donatists were naturally caressed as internecine foes of Christianity. Not only were they recalled from exile, and restored to their churches, but many of the basilicas of the Catholics, which they took with the armed hand, were secured to them. With the accession of Valentinian I., their audacity met with a check, that emperor passing very severe laws to keep it within limits. At the invasion of Africa by Gildo in the year 397, the Donatists had reason for joy, as he removed all restraint from their murderous proclivities. Honorius, however, put another stop to the slaughter of the orthodox, and sincerely endeavored to bring about a permanent peace. He sent into Africa a tribune named Marcellinus, a man of high character, who, in the year 411, held at Carthage that famous Conference, of which St. Augustine gives a full history, and in which he participated. In this assembly, both parties pleaded their causes with full liberty for three days, and after due consideration, Marcellinus passed judgment in

favor of the Catholics, and it was confirmed by Honorius on Jan. 30, 412. Terrified at the severe penalties pronounced against them by the emperor, and which were sternly executed by Dulcitius, the successor of Marcellinus, most of the Donatists yielded, and before many years the sect had vanished. It would seem that, violent and audacious as it was, this heresy made no headway outside of Africa. It tried to obtain a foothold in Rome, and there sustained successively six bishops, men of ability and of grave manners. But they met with no success, not obtaining the use of even one church in the city. Indeed, from the fact that their conventicles were held in the mountains of the neighborhood, they were known among the Romans as "Mountaineers."

We pass now to the doctrines of the Donatists. In regard to Baptism, they held that it was only valid when given in the Church. Since they contended that the true Church was to be found only in their communion, the rest of Christendom having fallen away from purity of doctrine, they rebaptized such perverts as they succeeded in enticing to their fold. As to their tenets concerning the Church, St. Augustine says they differed from Catholics rather as to the body than as to the head. By contact with the betrayers of the gospels, and by communion with the wicked in general, the Church had been reduced nearly unto death, and was then confined to Africa, and restricted, indeed, to the faction of Donatus. Africa, they said, was the southern country where the Spouse of the Canticles was represented as resting in the midday. According to St. Augustine, Donatus of Carthage erred in regard to the Trinity, teaching that the three Persons were of the same substance, but that the Son was less than the Father, and the Holy Ghost less than the Son. He did not succeed, however, in inculcating this theory upon his followers. As for the morals and general conduct of the Donatists, they seem to have been of the most horrible nature. Optatus charges them with literally throwing the Holy Eucharist to the dogs, "not without a token of the divine judgment: for the dogs went mad, and as though their masters were robbers and strangers, tore them to pieces, using their teeth against the violators of the Holy

Body." According to the same author, when they did not overthrow the Catholic altars, they practiced a sacrilegious rite of scraping the surface, to indicate that purification was necessary on account of the Catholic contagion. Whenever they obtained possession of a church, or of sacred vessels, vestments, &c., they reblessed them for the same reason. Of so exalted a character was their religious frenzy, that thousands of them took their own lives, deeming the act a martyrdom, and justifying it by the example of Razias, *Macch.* II. Like most heretics, the Donatists were very hostile to monks, and, according to St. Augustine, were fond of saying, "What is the meaning of the word 'monk'? Show us in the Scriptures this word 'monk.'" (1)

In treating of the Donatist heresy, we cannot omit some remarks upon the judgment given by Pope Melchiades in the synod held at Rome in the year 313, as both Protestant and Gallican writers have contended that the history of the Papal connection with the condemnation of this sect goes to weaken the doctrine of the irrefragability of Pontifical decisions. And firstly, Basnage and Mosheim hold that Pope Melchiades acted, in this decision, as a delegate of the emperor Constantine, and not in his own right, as the supreme judge in matters of faith. But we know from Optatus, that when the prince was approached by the sectarians, he cried out, "You ask of me, a secular, to give judgment, when I myself await the judgment of Christ?" And to the complaining Donatus, after the Roman synod, he answered, "O mad audacity of fury! Just as do the Gentiles, they put forth an appeal." We also know that when Constantine took cognizance of the case after the Council of Arles, it was with disgust at the audacity of the Donatists, and with the intention of "afterwards asking the pardon of the bishops" for daring to judge of sacred things (2). If such were the sentiments of the emperor as to the respective provinces of the ecclesiastic and the secular, is it credible that he would try to make a delegate of the Pontiff? Had the power of Melchiades been merely vicarious, would he have joined with himself the fifteen Italian bish-

(1) *On Psalm 132.*(2) AUGUSTINE, *epist.* 162.

ops whom the prince had not named? Again, those were given by Constantine as judges, whom the Donatists had asked for, namely, the three Gallic prelates, not Melchiades and the fifteen Italians. And if Constantine had thought himself possessed of any authority in the premises, would he have sent these Gauls all the way to Rome, especially when he himself was then in Gaul? But St. Augustine certainly regarded the Pontiff, not as an imperial delegate, but as exercising his own supreme judicial prerogative in the Roman synod, for he says of Constantine, "*He conceded the other Arletan judgment, not because it was necessary, but yielding to their perversity, and wishing in every way to repress their impudence*" (1). If the synod of Arles was not necessary, then certainly Melchiades had acted as supreme judge. Finally, if the Pontiff only judged in this Donatist matter, as the vicar of Constantine, how is it that Cæcilian was able, when and how he wished, to carry his case to the Apostolic See?

A question is raised as to whether or not the Donatists appealed to the emperor from the decision of Pope Melchiades. We have seen how they complained of it, and how the Council of Arles was assembled, in a vain attempt to pacify them. Alexandre contends that this complaint was of the nature of an appeal; Valois, Noris, and Sirmond hold that they only appealed from the Council of Arles. We may at once remark that the very nature of an appeal, if judicial forms are to be at all respected, precludes the sitting in the new court of those judges against whose previous decision the appeal is made. But we learn from the *Acts* of the Arletan synod that in it were seated as judges, besides the Roman Pontiff through his legates, five of the very bishops who had attended the Roman synod. Therefore, it is plain that at Arles there could have been no appeal from the sentence of the Pontiff. Against this conclusion is adduced the authority of Optatus, who plainly says that the Donatists appealed from the Roman synod to Constantine, that prince answering, "O mad audacity of fury, &c." But Optatus was mistaken, for he plainly shows, by

(1) *Epist.* 162.

making no mention of the synod of Arles, that he regarded the letter in question as sent by Constantine to the prelates of the Roman synod. We know that it was sent to the Arletan prelates from this passage of St. Augustine: "Nor did the Christian emperor so dare to receive the tumultuous and deceitful complaints, as to himself judge of the decision of the bishops who had sat at Rome. But he assigned other bishops, from whom, however, they preferred to appeal; for which, as to how he detested them, you have heard." These last words refer to that exclamation "O mad audacity, &c." It is plain then that the letter in which the emperor used this expression was sent to the prelates of Arles, and therefore, the testimony of Optatus must be excluded. According to Optatus, the Donatists appealed from that synod to which Constantine addressed the quoted words, and that synod was the one of Arles.

To the most casual reader of the events we have been narrating, at once occurs a question as to the relationship subsisting between the Roman synod, and the Council of Arles. Did the latter synod reconsider the judgment given by Pope Melchiades, and if so, was this reconsideration undertaken without the consent of the then Pontiff, Sylvester I.? Alexandre held that the latter supposition is *improbable*, but the Roman censors applied to his proposition the remark, "Neither question nor conclusion pleases us. The question does not, because it is to be supposed, not discussed, that Councils cannot reconsider causes of faith already adjudged by the Supreme Pontiff; the conclusion does not, because it says, 'it is probable,' while nothing is more certain." Before the Council of the Vatican settled the question of Papal infallibility, the Gallican theologians were fond of this matter of the Arletan synod, and such Protestant writers as trouble themselves at all about Church authority have ever pointed to it as a weak spot in the Roman line of defence. One of the best writers in defence of the irreformability of Papal decisions on faith, is Cardinal Orsi. In his apposite work, refuting the allegations of Bossuet, he shows that the cause of Cæcilian, having been decided by Pope Melchiades, was no longer a subject matter for retractation; that

it could not have been reconsidered without the permission of the Holy See ; and that the cause of Cæcilian, of which Augustine speaks in a passage adduced by Bossuet, and to be now noticed by us, was not one of those causes which belong to the Universal Church. Cardinal La Luzerne, in his book on the Gallican "Declaration" of 1682, opines that the arguments of Orsi are not conclusive. Equally with the bishop of Meaux, La Luzerne relies greatly upon the following passage of St. Augustine (1): "Let us suppose that all the bishops, who judged at Rome, were not good judges. There yet remained a plenary Council of the whole Church, in which the cause of these judges could be agitated, in order that their sentence might be abrogated, if they were convicted of a wrong decision." This shows, say the Gallican authors, that, according to St. Augustine, there remained a general Council in which the Pontiff's decision might be rescinded, and though that Council did not rescind it, yet the cause of Cæcilian was settled with no less authority because the judgment of Melchiades received the approbation of the Church. But this plenary Council, of which Augustine speaks, could not have been held without the consent of the Pope, or without his presidency, either personal or by means of legates. And if a general Council, with the Pope at its head, takes up a cause already defined by the Pontiff, and with the Pope's consent and participant action, repeats the Pontifical decision, it does not follow that either Pontiff or bishops deem the judgments of the Holy See a matter for conciliar revision. It is one thing to take up a decision, in order to assent and submit to it, and another to subject it to a critical and judicial discussion. When we come to treat of the Councils of Ephesus, Chalcedon, and the third Constantinopolitan, we shall see that the fathers read the decrees of the pontiffs, actuated by the former, not the latter motive. If then, in the passage of Augustine, the holy doctor declares that to the Donatists yet remained the authority of a general Council, we must not conclude that he believed that the said synod could revise the judgment of Melchiades. He wished to press the

(1) *Epist.* 43, alias 162, to *Glorius Eleusius*, c. 7, n. 19.

Donatists to the wall by showing them that the whole Church was against them. We have already heard him say that the emperor yielded to the Donatists in the matter of the Council of Arles, "not because it was necessary, but ceding to their perversity, and wishing in every way to curb their impudence." When, then, he alludes to a possible future plenary Council, he means to say that if such a synod were to take up the judgment of Melchiades, its unanimous assent would show the Donatists that those were "good judges" indeed who pronounced sentence in Rome. It will not be inopportune to here introduce a passage of Optatus which plainly shows that he did not deem the decision of Pope Melchiades revisable by a Council (1). He speaks of the absolution of Cæcilian "by the sentence of Melchiades, through which the trial was closed," and says that the two bishops sent by the Pope into Africa to promulgate his decree, did so, saying that "it could not be abrogated ; they thus communicated it to the clergy of Cæcilian, and returned."

---

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### ARIANISM, AND THE COUNCIL OF NICE.

Scarcely had the persecution of brute force been brought to an end by the accession of Constantine to the imperial throne, when the Church was called upon to withstand the attacks of a more insidious enemy. If not in one shape, then in another; if not in one place, then in another, the Church upon earth must be ever militant. The new enemy came in the shape of the most radical heresy which to this day she has ever encountered, and the new error soon made proportionately greater inroads upon her flock than any other had done before, or has done since that time. But with all its apparent successes, in spite of the active and enthusiastic aid of the secular power, that great heresy has vanished.

(1) *Donatist Schism*, b. 1, n. 24

Arius was born in Libya, and was subject to the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishop of Alexandria. He was of a nature to win the affections of men—his manners were grave but gentle; he was modest in his bearing, dress, and conversation. In dialectics, he was a master. Several years before he turned his attention to innovation, he had acquired some experience as a schismatic, having joined the followers of Meletius of Lycopolis, when that bishop refused to submit to his deposition by his superior, St. Peter of Alexandria. Abandoning the schism, Arius received deaconship at the hands of the latter prelate, but when St. Peter excommunicated the Miletians, the young deacon became so vituperative that he was soon involved in the same sentence. After the martyrdom of St. Peter, his successor, Achilla, restored Arius to communion, and probably raised him to the priesthood (1). At the death of this prelate the future heresiarch aspired to the vacant see, and when he saw Alexander preferred by the clergy, he was devoured by envy. He commenced to disseminate his errors as to the Divinity of the Son of God about the year 317 (2). According to St. Epiphanius, he soon counted for his disciples one bishop, Secundus of Pentapolis, seven priests, and seven hundred nuns; however, St. Alexander, in an encyclical epistle, speaks of only fourteen of such disciples. They were soon condemned by Alexander, and Arius fled for a time into Palestine. In order to popularize his tenets, he now struck upon the idea of reducing them to poetical shape, and setting the verses to popular music. He took for his model Sotades, an old Egyptian poet, with whom the mob was familiar. Under the name of *Thaleia*, a mixture of obscenity and distorted theology was soon chanted in the streets and public places, and thus the new religion was sprung upon humanity. His seven hundred nuns were probably of considerable help to the enterprising theologian, and he soon received quite an important acquisition from the same devout sex in the person of the imperial Constantia, sister of Constantine. The patronage of this lady was of great advantage to the new

(1) According to Gelasius of Cyzicus, Arius was ordained by Alexander.

(2) St. Jerome dates the rise of Arianism from the year 321; a falsified codex of Lactantius places it before the persecution of Licinius, about 310.

heresy, for she possessed more than her due share of influence at court. Eusebius of Nicomedia now held a synod in Bythinia, and sent out a letter to all his brethren of the episcopate, entreating them to communicate with the Arians, and to compel Alexander to do the same; in this epistle he also congratulates Eusebius of Cæsarea on having undertaken the "defence of the truth." Many and desperate were the arts used by the friends of the new doctrine to gain over the emperor, but he decided to request the Supreme Pontiff to convoke a General Council of the Church. Accordingly, in the year 325, there assembled at Nice of Bythinia three hundred and eighteen bishops under the presidency of the legates of Pope Sylvester, Hosius, bishop of Cordova, and Vitus and Vincent, priests. In this Œcumenical Council the doctrine of Arius, as to the non-consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, was condemned; a symbol of faith—a Creed—was issued, and in it was inserted the apposite word "Homœousion." This Council also decided the vexed question as to the time of the Paschal celebration, establishing it on the Sunday following the fourteenth day of the March moon. It also edited twenty disciplinary canons, on the sixth of which we shall have something to say. At the sessions of the Council the emperor was present, but was placed below the fathers, and took his seat only when they gave the signal of permission. The expenses of the prelates were defrayed by the imperial treasury. The sentiments held by Constantine as to the relative positions of priesthood and empire are plainly indicated by the following remarks made by him during the Council, when the Arians presented to him certain petitions, tending to draw him over to their side. Having ordered the petitions to be burnt in full synod, he thus addressed the bishops (1): "God has established you as priests, and given you power to judge us, and hence we are properly judged by you; you, however, cannot be judged by men; wherefore, among yourselves await the judgment of God alone, and let your differences, whatever they may be, be reserved for divine examination. For you have been given to us as gods by God, and it is not proper for

(1) RUFINUS, *Hist.*, b. 1, c. 1.

man to judge gods, but only Him of whom it is written : God has stood in the synagogue of the gods, and in their midst God judges." Two only of the most violent, and perhaps the most sincere, Arians, refused to sign the symbol of faith, Secundus of Ptolemaide, and Theonas of Marmarica ; even Eusebius of Cæsarea feigned submission (1).

After the condemnation of Arius, the emperor ordered him into exile, but in the year 330, at the intercession of Constantia, then at the point of death, he sent for him and accorded him an interview. Being asked whether he would assent to the Nicene creed, he answered in the affirmative. Requested to put his Creed into writing, he handed the prince an equivocal formula, which could easily be interpreted in an heretical sense. With the permission of Constantine, Arius now returned to Alexandria, bearing letters from Eusebius of Nicomedia, urging St. Athanasius to admit the apparently repentant priest into communion. But the inflexible bishop would not yield, even though the emperor followed up his endorsement of the request by threats to depose and exile him. In the year 335, many bishops, principally of the Arian faction, assembled at Jerusalem for the dedication of the magnificent temple built by Constantine. Requested by the emperor to examine the symbol of Arius, they pronounced it orthodox. Finally, in the year 336, Constantine called the heresiarch to the capital, and ordered the bishop, Alexander, a firm defender of the Nicene faith, to accord communion to him. Force was being used to effect this nefarious purpose, when Arius was suddenly stricken with death. But with its founder, the heresy did not disappear. The Arian sympathy of the emperor Constantius secured the condemnation of St. Athanasius in the synods of Arles (353) and Milan (355), and before long St. Jerome was obliged to cry out that the world was half Arian. On the death of Valens (378) the heresy began to decline in the East, and after the General Council of Constantinople, it lost all hold in those parts. But the barbarous tribes of Germany long clung to it. Its last

(1) ATHANASIUS, *Epist. on decrees of Nice* ; THEODORET, b. 1, c. 19 ; ST. JEROME, *Dialogue against the Luciferians*.

refuge was among the Lombards, but with king Liutprand (744) it died out.

Arius asserted that the Son of God was a creature, and not God by nature; that although He existed before all ages, yet He was not co-eternal with the Father. Eusebius of Nicomedia endeavored to persuade Constantine that this doctrine was not antagonistic to Catholic faith, that the whole question was one of verbal subtlety. But it is evident that Arius denied the Divinity of Christ, when he denied the Consubstantiality of the Son with the Father. He also erred in regard to the mystery of the Incarnation, asserting that the Word took unto Itself a body without a soul; that the office of soul was supplied by the Divinity (1). He perverted the doxology, singing "Glory to the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Ghost." St. Augustine (2) says that Arius rebaptized his perverts from Catholicism, but he seems to be alone in the assertion.

Arianism met the inevitable fate of all heresies, and was soon cut up into many factions. Of these there were three principal sects. First, were the Anomœians, so called because they contended that the Son was *Anomoios*, that is, dissimilar to the Father. Not only, according to them, was the Son not equal to the Father, but he was in no way similar. The principal leaders of this sect were Aetius, Eunomius, and Euzoius of Antioch. Then came the Semiarians, who, while they denied the Consubstantiality (*homoousia*) of the Son with the Father, yet held that He was similar (*homoiousios*) in all things, even in substance. The chiefs of this sect were Basil of Ancyra, George of Laodicea, and Eustathius of Sebaste. Finally are to be mentioned the Acacians, who drew their name from Acacius, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine. These differed from the Anomœians only in name, and abstained from asserting a thorough dissimilarity between Father and Son only when circumstances of interest compelled them; when, however, they were withheld by fear of Constantius, who abhorred the Anomœians, they said the Son was not Consubstantial, nor similar in substance, to the Father, but only similar.

(1) THEODORET, *Hæret. Fab.*, c.1; ATHANASIUS, *Advent of Christ*.

(2) *On Heresies*.

Let us now turn our attention to the Council of Nice. Several questions are to be considered, and, first of all, the convocation of the Council. The adversaries of the Holy See contend that the Council was not convoked by Pope Sylvester, but by the emperor Constantine, and this assertion they support by passages from Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret, Nicephorus, and by the synodical epistle which the Council sent to the church of Alexandria, in which the fathers say, "Since, by the grace of God, and the command of the most sacred emperor Constantine, who has called us together, from various provinces and cities, the great and holy Nicene Council is assembled." Similar expressions with regard to the Council of Nice occur in the *Relation* of the fathers of the Council of Ephesus to the emperors Theodosius and Valentinian, and in the remarks of Justinian in the 1st *Collation* of the Fifth General Council. Our ancestors in the faith, therefore, say the adversaries of Rome, believed that the right of calling an (Ecumenical Council resided in the emperor, not in the Pope. There is no doubt that Constantine paved the way for this Council, that he invited to it the bishops of the world, that he treated them as his guests, that he assisted at the sessions, that, in fine, he cast around it, by way of protection, the strong arm of the secular power. From the fact of ancient authors gratefully acknowledging these services of the emperor, and hence using the term "convocation" in regard to his invitation, it by no means follows that in their minds the convoking authority of Pope Sylvester was ignored. The fathers of the Council of Sardica (347) used the same word with regard to the action of the emperors Constans and Constantius, and yet St. Athanasius (1) tells us that the Council was called by Pope Julius. In the Eighth General Council (869) the Eastern vicars said that the emperor Basil, imitating the old emperors, had called the synod, but we know from the letter of Pope Adrian II. to that sovereign, which was read in the first session, that the Pontiff convoked the Council. "We wish," said the Pope, "through your pious exertions, a numerous synod to be assembled at Constan-

(1) *Epist. to Solitaries.*

tinople." And the Papal legates used these words, "The most pious and most Christian emperor, following the example of his predecessors, sent his most noble ambassadors to Rome, to ask for a synod." That the fathers of the Second General Council (381) regarded the convocation of such assemblies as the prerogative of the Holy See, is shown by their Synodical Letter to Pope Damasus, in which they say that they have come to Constantinople in obedience to the Pontiff's letters to Theodosius. Finally, with regard to the convocation of the Nicene Synod, the fact of the Pontifical legates presiding over its deliberations, the humble attitude of Constantine during its sessions, and his own words already quoted, go to show that the emperor considered himself as bound to facilitate the work of the Church, but felt that he possessed no authority in the premises. Had the sovereign been regarded at that time as enjoying the right of convoking Councils, Hosius would scarcely have used the following words to Constantius: "Concern thyself not with ecclesiastical affairs, nor teach us in such matters, but rather learn from us. To thee God has committed the empire, to us He has given the things of the Church; and as he who reviles thy government, contradicts the divine ordinance, so do thou beware, lest by taking to thyself the things of the Church, thou becomest guilty of a great crime. Give, it is written, to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's, and to God that which is God's. It is not right for us to hold empire upon earth, nor hast thou, emperor, any jurisdiction over incense or sacred things."

In treating of the presidency of the Council of Nice, we propose to show that the Papal legates not only presided, but that they did so, precisely because of their office as representatives of the Supreme Pontiff. With regard to the presidency of Hosius, we have from Athanasius (1), "In what synod was he not the leader and standard-bearer? What church does not retain monuments of his presidency?" Socrates, in book 1. chap. 9, giving the names of the fathers of Nice, begins thus: "In this Council were present Hosius, bishop of Cordova; Vitus, and Vincentius, priests; Alexander,

(1) *Apology for his Flight.*

bishop of Egypt. Eustathius of great Antioch, Macarius of Jerusalem, Harpocraton, Cynon, and others, whose names, &c." Unless Hosius, Vitus, and Vincentius, were presiding officers, why does Socrates place their names before those of the incumbents of the great sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem? Hosius was simply bishop of insignificant Cordova, and the other two were not even bishops. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims (d. 882), when writing against his nephew, Hincmar of Laudun—and speaking of the Nicene Council, says: "Over which, in the place of Sylvester, presided Hosius, bishop of Cordova, Vitus and Vincent, priests of the city of Rome." Some ultra-Gallican critics have held that Hosius presided indeed over the Nicene Council, but that such office was assigned him as a compliment to his heroic labors for religion, not because of his position as Papal legate. Firstly, we may answer that this is a mere conjecture, and it is founded on no pre-eminent excellence really possessed by Hosius over his brother bishops. There was Paphnutius, who had undergone fearful tortures during the reign of Maximian; so also had Potamon. Paul, bishop of the Euphratesian Neo-Cæsarea, had suffered all but death under Licinius. Then there were present many prelates who were famous for their miracles and for the gift of prophesy, such as James of Nisibis, Spiridion of Cyprus, Nicholas of Lycia. As for influence with Constantine, no one equalled Eusebius of Cæsarea. As far as dignity of position was concerned, there were Eustathius of Antioch, and Alexander of Alexandria. And yet we see elevated above all these prelates the bishop of an insignificant diocese in distant Spain. He is placed above two legates of the Roman See, above the Alexandrian and Antiochene patriarchs, above Cæcilian, the primate of all Africa. When he sits in the Council of Elvira, in his own Spain, although there are present but nineteen bishops, he holds the second place; and when he sits in the Council of Arles, he is not mentioned among the chief prelates (1). Again, if we do not admit that Hosius presided by virtue of his legatine authority, we must accuse

(1) ST. AUGUSTINE, *against Parmenian*, b. 2, c. 5.

the fathers of Nice of having violated those privileges of the patriarchates, which they confirmed in this very synod; the bishop of Alexandria would no longer have held the second place, decreed to him according to ancient customs. But at this time there was a canon which recognized in the Roman See the right of presiding in all synods wherein was discussed anything pertaining to the Universal Church. In an epistle to the Eusebian prelates of the East, Pope Julius I. (337-352) says that they have violated the canons in not inviting him to their synod: "Since the ecclesiastical canon forbids any decrees to be sanctioned without the judgment of the Roman bishop." That canon was in the mind of the Council held at Rome by Pope Damasus, when it reproved the prelates of Rimini for having edited a profession of faith which Rome had not passed upon. It also governed the fathers of the fifth General Council (553), when after having thrice invited Pope Vigilius to preside at their deliberations, they wrote to him, through Eutychius of Constantinople, "And we therefore beseech you, that your Blessedness presiding over us, with priestly tranquillity and gentleness, the holy Gospels being brought forward, by a common discussion these same Chapters may be treated, and an end put to the question." But it is incredible that the presidency of the bishop of Cordova should have been accepted by all the bishops at Nice, if his legatine position had not compelled them to accept it. To say nothing of the rights of the patriarchs, there were Theognis, bishop of Nice itself, and Eusebius of Nicomedia, metropolitan of all Bythinia, both intensely Arian, and not at all likely, if they could avoid it, to acquiesce in the choice of a president whom they knew to be hostile to their cause. We must conclude therefore that they regarded Hosius as president of the Council by virtue of his position as Papal legate. As for Vitus and Vincent, it is impossible to assign any reason for their being recognized as colleagues of Hosius, unless that furnished by their legatine quality, for, as simple priests, they had no right even to a seat in the Council.

The Nicene Council issued twenty canons. Among the Maronites of the Lebanon, the Armenians, Copts, Abyss-

sinians, and other Orientals, both United and Schismatic there have been regarded as Nicene sixty-four other canons; but that they are supposititious, and no older than the time of the Council of Chalcedon (451), is proved by their frequent presentation of the term "patriarch," as applied to the bishops of the greater sees—that name having been introduced into the hierarchical nomenclature at that period. That the Nicene canons numbered only twenty, is shown by all the ancient *Collections*, among which may be specially quoted that of Dionysius Exiguus (6th Cent.) and the one drawn up by Theilo and Tharistus, and sent by Atticus of Constantinople in the year 419 to the sixth Council of Carthage. The same is proved by the fact that, in the cause of the appeal of Apiarius to Pope Zosimus (417), the Nicene canons furnished by St. Cyril of Alexandria were of that number. Again, Theodoret, book 1, c. 8, expressly says: "The bishops again assembling in Council, issued twenty laws or canons on Church administration." It is true that Rufinus, in his *History*, c. 6, b. 1, cites twenty-two canons, but that comes from his dividing the sixth and eighth into two parts each.

Only one of the Nicene canons calls for any special consideration in a work such as the present. The sixth canon reads as follows: "Let the ancient custom be preserved throughout Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis; that the bishop of Alexandria have power over all these; because such is the custom with the bishop of Rome. Similarly in Antioch, and the other provinces, let their privileges be preserved by the churches. Generally, however, this is clear, that if any one be made a bishop without the consent of his metropolitan, the great Synod defines that such ought not to be a bishop. If, then, two or three, on account of their own contentions, contradict the common decree of all, reasonable and approved according to ecclesiastical rule, let the sentence of the majority (*plurimorum*) obtain." In interpreting this canon, all recognize a certain comparison between the churches of Rome and Alexandria. Some hold that only the metropolitan's privileges as to episcopal appointments are established; others that the patriarchal rights are arranged

Protestants in general contend that by this canon the theory of Roman supremacy is subverted, for, they say, by it the Roman jurisdiction is restricted to the "suburban regions," which do not extend beyond the hundredth mile-stone from the Eternal City. And Rufinus of Aquileia certainly interpreted the canon as reading, "That in the Alexandrian diocese, and in the City, the ancient custom be preserved, that the former should have the care of Egypt, and the latter of the suburban churches." Photius, the prime author of the Greek schism, made considerable use of this canon in carrying out his design. But nothing is more sure than that, even after the Council of Nice, the Roman Pontiff was regarded by the entire Church as endowed with jurisdiction over the patriarchs. What then did the fathers of Nice mean to establish when they edited this sixth canon? In the first place, there is nothing in the canon to justify the Protestant interpretation of the reading of Rufinus. Why should that author be supposed, in the use of the phrase "suburban regions," to allude to that limited territory lying within the hundredth mile-stone from Rome? Why could he not have meant to signify the Western patriarchate? The canon assigns to the Alexandrian jurisdiction all the immense region of Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis; is it likely that Rufinus would have interpreted the same canon as giving to the great patriarch of the West only that narrow strip of territory commonly known as the suburban region? The Protestant reading of Rufinus is strained. The natural reading of the canon, and therefore the proper interpretation of the phrase of Rufinus, is that as the Roman Pontiff has immediate jurisdiction over the countries of the West, so the Eastern patriarchs should wield that authority over their respective regions which time and law had given them. And we should consider the circumstances which gave rise to this sixth canon. Meletius, the bishop of Lycopolis, had usurped the patriarchal rights of the bishop of Alexandria, and that bishop, Alexander, had complained thereof to the Council. The fathers therefore framed a canon in which, although incidentally legislating upon the appointing authority of the patriarchs, they protected in general all the

privileges of the great sees of Alexandria and Antioch, asserting that as the entire West was subject to the patriarchal sway of Rome, so the East should be divided between the patriarchates of Alexandria and Antioch. In fine, we may say with Henry de Valois (1), that the citation from Rufinus is not a version, but a paraphrase, of the canon, and the adversaries of Rome have badly interpreted it. An authoritative interpretation of this sixth canon can be found in the 16th *Action* of the Council of Chalcedon. Paschasius, the Papal legate, having been asked to produce the canon of Nice which he had alleged against that Council's 28th canon, he thus recited it from his codex: "The Sixth canon of the 318 Fathers: That the Roman Church has always had the Primacy; let Egypt however hold, that the bishop of Alexandria has power over all, because such is the custom with the Roman bishop. Similarly also, for him who is constituted in Antioch, and in other provinces, let the churches of the greater cities have the primacy." Against this reading not one protested, but all answered, "We declare that the Primacy, and chief honor, according to the Canons, be preserved to the Archbishop of ancient Rome." That in this canon the primacy of Rome was asserted, Gelasius I. (492) certainly believed, since in his epistle to the Orientals concerning Acacius, he asked, "With what reason or sequence can deference be paid to the other sees, if the ancient reverence is not paid to the first see of Blessed Peter, through which the dignity of all priests is always strengthened and confirmed, and to which by the singular and invincible judgment of three hundred and eighteen fathers, the most ancient honor was adjudged?" So also opined Boniface I. (418-422), in his epistle to the bishops of Thessaly. "The institution of the Universal rising Church assumed its beginning in the honor of Blessed Peter, in whom its government resides. For from him as source, in the increasing regard for religion, ecclesiastical discipline spread through all the churches. The precepts of the Nicene Synod testify to nothing else, since it dared not to establish anything in regard to him above whose

(1) *Observations on a New Version of the Histories of Socrates and Sozomenus*, c. 1.

merit it saw nothing could be conferred; it knew in fine that to him everything had been conceded by the words of the Lord." In treating of this canon, and its paraphrase by Rufinus, the learned Oratorian, John Morin (1), holds that this writer understood the entire West by the term "suburban churches." He well observes that from the time of Augustus to that of Constantine, the whole world was regarded as "suburban" to Rome, that is, subject to its rule, and owing it all reverence and submission. No other city at that time disputed the palm of empire with Rome. But when Constantine transferred the imperial residence to Byzantium, the new capital was soon designated as the "governing city," the "New Rome." This method of distinguishing the two rivals was especially prevalent in the time of Arcadius and Honorius, when Rufinus lived. The empire was practically divided into two parts, the Eastern and Western; at the head of the one was Rome, of the other Constantinople. At this time, therefore, the entire world was no longer "suburban" to the Eternal City; only the West continued to be so designated. In the mind of Rufinus the "suburban churches" were all the Western churches which go to make up the Roman patriarchate, and hence his exposition of the sixth Nicene canon would be, "Let the bishop of Alexandria exercise throughout his subject dioceses all patriarchal rights, according to ancient customs, just as the bishop of Rome patriarchally governs the churches of the West." It may also be observed that the interpretation of Rufinus, granting it to be adverse to the claims of Rome, is of little value to our opponents, since its sincerity is liable to more than suspicion. He nourished profound hatred for the Roman Church, having been excommunicated by Pope Anastasius. Both Anastasius (2) and St. Jerome (3) use very severe terms in his regard. His authority is unreliable too on account of his ignorance. He makes out St. James, bishop of Jerusalem, to be bishop of the Apostles; he confounds Eusebius of Pamphili, an Arian bishop, with Pamphilus the martyr; he knows no differ-

(1) *Ecclesiastical Exercises*, No. 30.

(2) *Epist. to John of Jerusalem*.

(3) *2nd Apol. against Rufinus*.

ence between Sixtus, a Pagan philosopher, and St. Sixtus, Pope and martyr; he thinks a *chorepiscopus* is a bishop without a diocese. St. Jerome says of Rufinus, "he teaches what he knows not, he writes of what he is ignorant." "He talks so stinkingly (*sic*) and confusedly, that Jerome is more fatigued in reproving than Rufinus was in writing." "Thou hast so much knowledge of the Greek and Latin languages that the Greeks take thee for a Latin, and the Latins for a Greek." According to St. Jerome, Rufinus was in his writings "a solecist and barbarous," "a liar, impudent, and sly." Granted then that the term "suburban" used by Rufinus should be understood as it is by the adversaries of Rome, little can be gained by them by the allegation of such an authority (1). No more need be said of Rufinus; so much would not have been written, were it not that in his reading of the sixth Nicene canon is found the only apparent justification of the idea that the Nicene Council gave equal authority to the three patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch.

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

### THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF SARDICA.

This Council was held by decree of Pope Julius I. in the year 347. It has not been generally mentioned, under its own name, as one of the Œcumenical Councils, because it was regarded as a kind of appendix to that of Nice. Again, to use the words of the learned Ballerini brothers (2), in enumerating those Councils, the decrees of which were to be received as so many gospels, the olden writers only thought of such synods as were held for the purpose of condemning some particular heresy, and the Synod of Sardica dealt only with the relics of Arianism, upon which the main attack had been made by the fathers of Nice. The

(1) In his 20th Dissertation, when treating of the 4th century, Natalis Alexander gives several instances of omission, addition, and interpolation of the Nicene canons, on the part of Rufinus.

(2) *The Ancient Collections and Collectors of Canons down to Gratian*, p. I., c. 7.

reason for its convocation was furnished by the calumnies of the Eusebian faction against St. Athanasius, Marcellus of Ancyra, and Asclepa of Gaza, and by the dissatisfaction evinced among those malcontents at the restoration of these prelates to communion by Pope Julius. This Pontiff presided over the Council by means of his legates, Hosius of Cordova, and the priests Archidamus and Philoxenus. We do not know to a certainty the number of bishops who attended the sessions, for Theodoret places the number at two hundred and fifty, while Socrates and Sozomenus say there were three hundred Western prelates, and seventy-six Orientals. St. Athanasius, in his *Apology*, says, that besides the sixty bishops who, before the Synod, attested in writing their belief in his innocence, there did the same at Sardica, ninety-two from the Italian provinces, thirty-four from Gaul, thirty-six from Africa, ninety-two from Egypt, fifteen from Palestine, and twelve from Cyprus; in all, that is, two hundred and eighty-four. But in the beginning of this same *Apology*, the saint tells us that there were at Sardica, bishops from Isauria, Pamphylia, Lycia, Galatia, Dacia, Thrace, Dardania, Macedonia, Epirus, &c., which would indicate that the number 284 did not comprehend all the fathers of the Synod.

Scarcely had the bishops assembled for the Council, when the Eusebian faction, to the number of eighty, retired to Philippopolis, where they held an independent Synod, retaining the name of "Council of Sardica." They took this action because the fathers would not commence the proceedings by ejecting Athanasius and his companions from their body. After their departure, the Council solemnly absolved Athanasius, Marcellus, Asclepa, and others who had been wickedly condemned by the Eusebians; and deprived of their bishoprics Valens, Ursacius, Narcissus, Stephen of Antioch, Acacius of Cæsarea, Menophant of Ephesus, and George of Laodicea. In their Synodical Epistle, notifying Pope Julius of their action, the fathers say that "it will be right and proper that the priests of the Lord, from all the provinces, refer all to the head, that is, to the See of the Apostle Peter."

With regard to the convocation of this Council, the same reasoning will apply that we have used in treating of the calling of the Nicene Synod. That Hosius, Archidamus and Philoxenus presided, appears from the 2nd *Apology* of Athanasius, in which he says, "Of those who subscribed in the Synod these are the names : Hosius from Spain ; Julius of Rome, through Archidamus and Philoxenus, his priests ; Protogenes of Sardica, &c." The factious prelates of Philippopolis prove the same in their Synodical Letter, "And since those who were with Hosius wished to violate the Catholic and Apostolic faith, &c." The Council of Chalcedon, in its allocution to the emperor Marcian, says that "Hosius presided over those who, at Sardica, pronounced sentence against the remnants of Arius."

Against the œcumenicity of this Council, the captious Archbishop De Marca, in his celebrated work on the *Concord of the Priesthood and the Empire*, b. 7, c. 3, holds that while it was general in the beginning, yet the course and exit of the synod were such as to destroy all claim to œcumenicity. The Council was intended, he says, to be composed of the prelates of all the provinces, both Eastern and Western ; but the Philippopolitan secession reduced the synodical body to the dimensions of a Western, not a General, Council. To this we answer, in the first place, it is untrue that all the Orientals seceded, for the bishops of Palestine, Arabia, Egypt, and the neighborhood of Constantinople, remained and signed the decrees. This is proved by the heading of the Synodical Epistle sent by the fathers to the church of Alexandria. "The holy Synod, by the grace of God, congregated at Sardica, from Rome, Spain, Gaul, Italy, Africa, Sardinia, Pannonia, Mysia, Dacia, Noricum, Tuscany, Dardania, the second Dacia, Macedonia, Thessaly, Achaia, Epirus, Thrace, Rhodes, Palestine, Arabia, Crete, Egypt, to the Priests and Deacons and the universal Church of God in the Alexandrian district, beloved brethren, health in the Lord." And the rebellious prelates themselves admitted that many Eastern bishops remained at Sardica. In their Synodical Epistle, they say, "An immense multitude of bishops, arriving from Constantinople

and Alexandria, drew together in Sardica, and having united them with themselves, Hosius and Protogenes held a Council." But granted that all the Orientals were Eusebians, and that all seceded from the Council, no argument can be deduced against the œcumenicity of the Council. It had legitimately assembled, in obedience to the call of the Roman Pontiff, and the secessionists had no legitimate motive for their defection. They were guilty of open schism, and when the decayed branches are lopped off, the vitality of the tree is not affected. If the Eusebian revolt impaired the authority of the Sardican Council, the 1st Council of Constantinople was not general, for there the Macedonians, against whom that body was convoked, were wanting; nor was the Council of Ephesus œcumenical, for there were absent John of Antioch and his suffragans; nor again were the Councils of Trent and of the Vatican General, for in each of these were unrepresented those sections of the Greek and other Oriental churches which yet cling to their schism.

The canons of Sardica are in number twenty or twenty-one. Of these, the third, fourth, and seventh, claim our attention. To these canons is assigned by some writers the origin of appeal to Rome. Among these authors the principal are De Marca, Quesnel, Dupin, and Febronius (Hontheim). They have been fully confuted by such polemics as Alexander, the Ballerinis, and most triumphantly by Zaccaria, in his refutation of Hontheim entitled "*Anti-Febronio*." So far as our limits permit, we propose to show that the Council of Sardica did not initiate the right of appeal to Rome, but that long before the time of that Synod that right had been recognized by the Christian world. It is not our province to prove that this right of receiving appeals pertains of necessity to the Papacy; that must be left to the dogmatic theologian. Our task is purely historical, and in strictly confining ourselves within our own domain, we shall see that our ancestors held what Gallicans used to regard as ultramontane views on this subject, and what all Protestants deny. The first instance of an appeal to the Roman See which we shall adduce is that of

Marcion, in the year 142. Marcion was a son of the bishop of Sinope, and after having followed the monastic life for some years, was raised by him to the priesthood. Having seduced a young woman from the path of virtue, he was excommunicated by his father, and as the discipline of the Church in the matter of fornication, &c., was in those days very severe, he in vain tried again and again to be restored to communion. He then resolved to appeal to Rome. Arriving in the Eternal City, he found the Holy See vacant by the death of Pope Hyginus. Not waiting for the election of a new Pontiff, Marcion laid his case before the Roman clergy, and begged to be received into their communion (1). Now the Roman clergy could not have admitted him to communion without previously quashing the sentence of his bishop; therefore, Marcion's action must be regarded as an appeal from an inferior's condemnation to the judgment of a superior. He must have argued, as did St. Cyprian in a similar emergency, that the See of Rome "was the principal church, whence arises ecclesiastical unity (2). The request of Marcion was rejected, both because of the canons which forbade the admission of any cleric not bearing commendatory letters from his own bishop, and because of the vacancy of the Roman See, the Supreme Pontiff alone having the power to grant the mitigation of discipline which Marcion besought.

Another example of an appeal to Rome, "whence the authority of this Church is more and more confirmed," is found by Constant (3) in the affair of Privatus in the year 250. This heretic had been condemned in a synod of ninety bishops, and the sentence had been confirmed by Donatus of Carthage and by Pope Fabian. Upon the death of the Pontiff, the cunning Privatus endeavored to prevail upon the Roman clergy to accord him communion, but with the same result as Marcion had achieved.

The African churches furnish us with another instance of appeal to the Holy See in the year 252. The election of St. Cyprian had been opposed by Felicissimus and four

(1) ST. EPIPHANIUS, *b.* 42.(2) *Ej. d.* 45, *to Cornelius*.(3) *Epist. Rom. Pont.*, tom. 8, col. 227.

other priests, and they had chosen a certain Fortunatus. Excommunicated by St. Cyprian, all five fled to Rome, and appealed to Pope Cornelius. The bishop of Carthage complained strongly because of this proceeding but not because he denied the right of a bishop to appeal to Rome; rather because he regarded Fortunatus as possessed of no episcopal privileges, he having been illicitly, though validly, consecrated. A short time previously, the African church had prohibited the recourse of priests to Rome, and of this decree we shall treat in a special chapter. It is sufficient for our purpose that Fortunatus, regarding himself as possessed of episcopal rights, appealed to Pope Cornelius, and that St. Cyprian, looking upon him as no bishop, only denied his right according to the African canons which applied only to priests. An event which happened two years later than the above will throw some light upon the matter. Two Spanish prelates, Basilides and Martial, had been deposed for crime, and in their places were installed Sabinus and Felix. The former appealed to Pope Stephen, and that Pontiff ordered their restoration to their sees. Sabinus and Felix then crossed into Africa, and begged the sympathy of St. Cyprian. This bishop in a synod decided that the Pope had been deceived by Basilides, but he did not deny his right to receive the appeal of the deposed prelate.

The history of Paul of Samosata presents a fact, which, though it may not be necessarily regarded as an appeal, yet shows that the authority of synods was not, at that time, thought to be superior to Papal revision. Protected by Zenobia, the powerful queen of Palmyra, he refused to give place to Domnus, in whose favor he had been deposed. After the victory of the emperor Aurelian over Zenobia, the Christian bishops complained to that sovereign against Paul, and he decided that the episcopal residence and appurtenances should be handed over to that one of the claimants "to whom the Roman bishop and the Italian prelates of the Christian religion should write" (1). Aurelian being a Pagan, and therefore but little conversant with Church matters, could scarcely have come to the conclusion of referring the question to so

(1) EUSEBIUS, VII., c. 30.

distant a see as that of Rome, and one too of different nationality and language, unless the idea had been suggested to him either by the Oriental bishops or by Paul himself. The former may have done so in all sincerity, the latter in the hope of gaining time. In either case, the conclusion is favorable to our position.

Very interesting, and at the same time apodictically conclusive for our cause, is the episode of the Donatist treatment of the consecration of Cæcilian of Carthage. The Donatists contended that Cæcilian could not have acquired any episcopal rights, since his consecration was at the hands of Felix of Aptonga, whom they designated a "traitor." With Secundus, primate of Numidia, and seventy other bishops of the same ilk, they formed a synod, and in place of Cæcilian appointed Majorinus. Speaking of the pretended deposition of Cæcilian, St. Augustine says, "he might well despise so strong a conspiracy of many bishops, hostile to himself, when he found himself in communion with the Roman Church, in which was always in vigor the principality of the Apostolic chair. . . . and before which he was ready to plead his cause"(1).

Here was a question of a bishop condemned by a synod convoked from many provinces, and yet Augustine deemed that he might breathe securely for the simple reason that Rome was with him. The holy bishop of Hippo certainly recognized, therefore, the right of Rome to hear and to pronounce in the cause of Cæcilian. And the appeal took place. The Donatists, seeing that the communion of Cæcilian with Rome fortified the position which he held among Catholics, asked the emperor Constantine to call a Council to settle the question, and requested that the Synod should be composed of French bishops. But Constantine, knowing that the bishops of Gaul had no jurisdiction in Africa, wrote to Pope Melchiades, asking him to examine the matter, in union with three Gallic prelates. Melchiades judged the case, but in his examination, he joined with himself fifteen other bishops, all Italians. This episode certainly furnishes

(1) *Epist.* 43, *alias* 162.

an instance of an appeal to Rome, forced, if you please, but yet an appeal.

Finally, the history of St. Athanasius shows us that the canons of Sardica did not introduce the right of appeal to the Holy See. Liberatus the Deacon (1), speaking of John Talaja, says that "taking from him (Calendion of Antioch) synodical letters of intercession, be appealed to the Roman Pontiff, Simplicius, *just as did the Blessed Athanasius.*" Alexandre denies that this action of Athanasius was an appeal (2); he styles it a *refugium*. Yet it is certain that Pope Julius condemned the Eusebians and absolved Athanasius; that is, he examined and reversed the judgment of the former. Socrates and Sozomenus declare that Pope Julius restored Athanasius and several other prelates to the sees of which they had been unjustly deprived (3); Celestine tells the people of Constantinople the same (4), and so does Gelasius, in a letter to the bishops of Dardania (5). St. Athanasius himself, in his 2nd *Apology*, says: "Not once, but frequently, was judgment pronounced in our favor; first, in our own province, when to that end about a hundred bishops assembled; secondly, at Rome, when we and the other adversaries of Eusebius stood on trial against his calumniating letters; finally, for the third time, in the great Council of Sardica."

We now pass to an examination of some of the canons of Sardica, and to a refutation of their interpretation by Febronius. In the collection of Dionysius the Little, the third canon reads thus: "If any bishop shall have been judged in any matter, and shall be persuaded that he has a good case, so that he may desire a second Council, if it pleases you, let us honor the memory of St. Peter the Apostle; let those who examined the matter write to Julius, the Roman bishop, that if he deems it right to revise the judgment, it be revised, and let him appoint the judges. But if he decides that the cause is not of a nature to war-

(1) *Breviary*, c. 18.

(2) For a refutation of Alexandre in this matter, see the *Anti-Febbronio* of Zaccaria, p. 2, b. 3, c. 2, No. 8.

(3) *Book* 2, c. 15; and *Book* 3, c. 8, respectively.

(4) *Epist.* 14, *Rom. Pont.*, col. 1143.

(5) *Idem*, *ep.* 13.

rant a revision of what was done, what he shall decree shall be confirmed. Does this please all? The synod answers: It pleases." This canon was proposed by Hosius, and as he took special care, in proposing the seventh canon, to express the idea of appeal, whereas here there is no such mention, we must conclude that he had no thought of appeal, just then, in his mind. Again, in no appeal does the judge communicate with the superior; that is the province of the condemned. Hence when Pope Zosimus wished to show the Africans that the right of appeal to Rome had been acknowledged by the synod of Sardica, he cited, not the third, but the seventh canon. But there is a question of appeal in the fourth canon, which reads as follows: "The bishop Gaudentius said: If it pleases, let there be added to the sentence full of goodness which you have proffered, that if any bishop be deposed by the judgment of the neighboring bishops (this is the second judgment) and declares his wish that his case be adjudged at Rome, (the third judgment), after the appeal of him who appears deposed, let no other bishop be ordained for his see, until his cause be defined by the decision of the Roman bishop." To the appellant then is conceded a third trial, although already two decrees of deposition have been pronounced, the first by the prelates of his own province, and the second by his neighbors, assigned to him as judges, according to the third canon, by the Roman Pontiff. But Hosius desired a more ample declaration to be made, so after the settlement of other matters in the fifth and sixth canons, we find the seventh speaking thus plainly: "Bishop Hosius said: It pleased, however, that if any bishop was accused and judged, and deposed by the bishops of his own province, and if he who is deposed appeals and has recourse to the bishop of the Roman Church, and wishes to be heard by him; if that bishop believes it just to revise the judgment, and the discussion of the cause, let him deign to write to the neighboring bishops of the next province, that they carefully look into everything, and deliver a true and just sentence. And if he who asks for another hearing of his cause, moves the Roman bishop to send a priest as legate,

that bishop will do as he deems fit. And if he decides upon sending legates who, with the bishops, will in his name give judgment, he will so do. But if he believes that the bishops suffice to put an end to the business, he will do what to his prudence shall seem the most expedient." (1)

Febronius contends that in these canons the fathers of Sardica did not acknowledge in the Pontiff the absolute right to entertain all appeals, but only a right to arrange a revision of the cause, and that too in the original province, and by a new intervention of the same provincial bishops who had already delivered judgment. This theory is as old as the time of Hincmar, who pronounces it in a letter written in the name of king Charles the Bald to Pope John 8, and before the advent of Hontheim it had been confuted by Alexandre (2) and by the Ballerinis (3). To any one even casually reading the seventh canon, it would seem that the right of *appeal* was very clearly stated, but Febronius asserts that in the Greek text the condemned bishop is said to be "like" or "as an appellant" (*osper ekkalesameños*); and what is more, he holds that the *appeal* does not refer to the Pope, but to the *new judgment* demanded by the accused. Since the Latin version of the canons is the original one, we cannot see why it should be explained by the Greek. But the Greek text does not *necessarily* give the force of the Latin *quasi*, "like" or "as," displaying mere similarity. *Osper* may just as naturally signify "as" in the sense of "thus," and the phrase would then run "thus appealing." As for Febronius' idea that the *appeal* refers, not to the Pontiff, but to the *new judgment*, the conjunction *and* binds the *appeal* with the *recourse* which assuredly is had to the Pope. But the context of the canons is against the theory of Febronius. And first, as to the assertion that they only accord to the Pontiff the power to assign new judges to act with the others in the original province. The seventh canon speaks only of the neighboring prelates, who certainly formed no

(1) This canon is the seventh in the Latin collections, and fourth in the Greek. All the canons were first written in Latin, and then drawn up in Greek. When the latter were arranged, the above canon was placed immediately after the third, since the subject matter of both was the same.

(2) *Fourth Cent.*, diss. 28, *prop.* 2.

(3) *Observations on Quesnel's diss.* 5.

part of the first tribunal ; the fourth canon also mentions them alone. The third canon says that the Pope should "appoint judges," but the judges of the first instance were already appointed, and if they were also to sit in the second tribunal, there would be but little chance of a remedy being given for any injustice of the first. As for the assertion that the canons do not allow the Pope to decide the cause in Rome, but only to arrange a revision in the province where the first trial took place, the form adopted by Hosius, "let him deign to write," shows that no law is imposed upon the Pontiff, but only a suggestion is offered as to an easy means of expediting the affair. And if the Pope could send legates to give judgment in his name, could he not deliver it by himself? Does not the fourth canon expressly state that after the second trial the accused could call upon the Pontiff to finish the question? This decision would necessarily be given not in the province, but in Rome.

But these canons of Sardica do not pretend to confer a new privilege upon the Roman See ; they reaffirm, and more clearly explain, an ancient right exercised whenever there were occasion and opportunity. Only the fourth and seventh canons touch upon the subject of appeal, properly so called, and of these the former supposes that such appeals are and have been made, while the seventh merely indicates a manner of entertaining them, and leaves the method to the pleasure of the Supreme Pontiff. When the latter canon says that the Papal legates possess the authority of him who designates them, can it be supposed that the framers thought that they were conferring a power never before enjoyed? But we have seen that those who came after the Council of Sardica did not conceive such an idea of its canons, and that long before it, the Roman Pontiffs had received and acted upon appeals from all parts of the world.

## CHAPTER XX.

### ALLEGED HERESY OF POPE LIBERIUS.

In the year of our Lord 352, sixteenth of the reign of Constantius, son of Constantine, Liberius was elected to the Papal See to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Julius I. The circumstances of the time were difficult indeed, and none but a Pontiff of pre-eminent sanctity and prudence could have guided the ship of Peter with even moderate success. Arianism, perhaps the most powerful, though not the most immediately destructive, heresy, which the world has seen, was rampant throughout the world, and all the influence of the imperial authority was brought to bear to add to its already excessive audacity. At this time, Athanasius of Alexandria was the bulwark of Catholic orthodoxy in the East, and to defend him, therefore, and to be a good Catholic, were regarded as synonymous. The word *Homoousion* (Consubstantial), which the Council of Nice had added to the Creed, was looked upon as a test of belief in the Divinity of Christ. The word *Homoiousion* (Similar) was indicative of rank heresy, although there were some who persisted in its use, and in the rejection of the orthodox term, even while they held the Catholic doctrine. In the year 355, having again, after an interval of reconciliation, become opposed to St. Athanasius, the emperor endeavored to attract the Roman Pontiff to his aid. He sent to him the eunuch Eusebius with magnificent gifts, and when these failed, threats were employed. The sentiments of Pope Liberius are to be judged by his own answer to Constantius. "How can we condemn one who has been pronounced free from crime by two Synods, and whom the Roman Church has dismissed in peace? Who would approve of our action, if we were to be hostile to him absent, whom, when present, we have cherished and held in communion? The Ecclesiastical Canons run not thus, nor have we ever received such a tradition from the Fathers. But if the Emperor wishes in-

deed to exercise his care for Ecclesiastical peace, or if he wishes that which we have written in favor of Athanasius to be erased, let those things also be erased which have been written against him; let there then be held an Ecclesiastical Synod at a distance from the palace, where the Emperor is not at hand, nor any count is officious, nor any judge utters threats, and where the fear of God and the institutes of the Apostles alone suffice for everything, that in that place, before all else, the Faith of the Church be set forth, just as it was defined by the Fathers in the Nicene Council; then let all be ejected who are of the Arian opinion, and let their heresy be anathematized; then finally let a judgment on Athanasius be delivered, or upon any other person deemed guilty: and as many as are found guilty, so many let there be ejected, and as many as are pure, let them be absolved of guilt. For it cannot be allowed that those should sit in the Synod who are impious in belief, nor is it proper to question any one's deeds before we have security as to his religion. Every discord about faith is to be first abolished, and then action may be taken upon other things." The consequence of this worthy reply was the exile of the Pontiff into Thrace. On his way to punishment, Liberius had an interview with the sovereign, and as we know from St. Athanasius (1) he thus repelled the renewed attempts to seduce him: "Cease to persecute Christians. Do not try, through me, to bring heretical impiety into the Church. We Christians are prepared to sustain everything, ere we will suffer ourselves to be called Arians." Liberius also declared, "he thought it more important to keep the laws of the Church than to reside at Rome." When about to depart, he was offered a sum of money for his journey, in the name of the emperor, but he rejected it, saying: "Thou hast pillaged the churches of the earth, and now thou offerest me alms as to a guilty one! Go first, and become a Christian." Gibbon deems this spirited answer insulting. The exile of the Pontiff lasted three years, and was terminated by a decree of Constantius, in answer to the entreaties of the Roman matrons, on the occasion of his

(1) *Epistle to Solitaries.*

visit to the ancient capital. And now comes one of the most important questions that have ever challenged the investigation of the historian.

What change had come over Constantius that he so readily liberated the Pontiff, or rather, had any change taken place in Liberius? The character of the emperor had remained the same; it follows, then, say some, that the Pontiff yielded to the importunities of the sovereign, and to the cruelties of exile. This is a fearful accusation, and is made not only by the bitter enemies of the Church, but by those theologians who, writing before the Vatican Council had settled the vexed question of Papal Infallibility, readily seized upon every fact of history which might be brought to bear in favor of "Cis-montane" opinions. Gibbon says that "the Roman Pontiff purchased his return by some criminal compliances, and afterwards expiated his guilt by a seasonable repentance." Blondel, Basnage, and other Protestant authors, contend that Constantius did not accede to the prayer of the Romans, until Liberius had subscribed to the second of the Sirmian formulas, which was plainly heretical. Quite naturally, Jansenistic writers take the same view. Bossuet holds that the formula which the Pope signed was the most innocent of the three, but that he erred in thus conniving at a dissemblance of truth, for in this formula the consubstantiality of Christ to the Father was not stated. As at this time the communion of Athanasius was the true one, so, according to the Bishop of Meaux, Liberius was wrong in condemning him. Cardinal La Luzerne, who, though not a rank, was yet a firm Gallican, asserts that even if the Pontiff signed the first of the Sirmian formulas, he became guilty of heresy. There is a school of authors in which Liberius is treated with some consideration, but by which he is blamed for having condemned Athanasius and for communicating with the Eusebians; also for having signed the first formula of Sirmium, in which the word *Homousios*, the test of Catholic doctrine, was omitted. The most eminent of this class are Coustant and Mazocchi. Of the writers who defend Liberius from each and every charge, both of heresy and weakness, the most distinguished

are Cardinal Orsi, F. A. Zaccaria, Peter Ballerini and Palma.

The following are the arguments adduced by the authors who contend that our Pontiff was guilty of heresy: *First*, St. Hilary, at No. 11 of his book against Constantius, declares that he "does not know in which the Emperor showed the greater impiety; whether in the exile, or in the liberation of Liberius." The same saint, in the *Fragment* commencing, "For the fear of God," adduces an epistle of the Pope to the Orientals, in which he says: "I do not defend Athanasius, but as Julius, my predecessor of holy memory, had received him, I dreaded lest I should be deemed a prevaricator. But when I knew. . . . . that you had justly condemned him, I quickly assented to your decree. . . . . Therefore, Athanasius being deposed, with regard to which, all of your statutes are to be received by me and the Apostolic See, I say that I am united and at peace with all of you and all the Eastern Bishops. And that you may the more securely know that I proffer true faith in this letter, I have willingly accepted, without any contradiction, as it has been explained by our common brother, Demophilus, that Catholic faith which was discussed, explained, and received at Sirmium by all our brethren and fellow-bishops." There are three other epistles of Liberius in the *Fragments* of Hilary, all redolent of heterodox sentiment. Again, in the 6th *Frag.*, Hilary cries, "Anathema from me to thee, Liberius, and to thy companions!" And in *Frag.* 8, he says, "To the prevaricator and to the Arians I declare anathema." In No. 4 of *Frag.* 6 we have, "afterwards, when Liberius was sent into exile, all these things, which he had done or promised, he reduced to nothing, writing to the heretical Arian prevaricators who had pronounced unjust sentence against the orthodox Bishop Athanasius." *Second*, St. Jerome, in his *Chronicle*, says that "Liberius, conquered by the pain of exile, subscribed the heretical depravity, and entered Rome like a victor." And in his *Ecclesiastical Authors*, the holy doctor tells us that "the African Fortunatianus, bishop of Aquileia, is to be detested because he solicited, broke down, and compelled to an heretical subscription, Liberius, bishop of Rome." *Third*, the *Acts of Eusebius* show us the

Pontiff, after his return to the Eternal City, publicly teaching Arianism, and putting the priest Eusebius to death. *Fourth*, the *Pontifical Book*, of great weight with Bossuet, says that when Liberius arrived at Rome after his exile, he dared not to enter the city at once, but besought the aid of the princess Constantia; that Felix, the Anti-Pope, was then expelled; that Liberius entered, fraternized with the Arians, and persecuted the orthodox who refused to recognize his authority. At first glance, these four arguments seem to form a terrible indictment against Liberius, but they will not bear the sifting of impartial criticism.

Now as to St. Hilary, his remark as to the impiety of Constantius in the liberation of the Pope does not prove that the saint thought that the Pontiff had assented to the Emperor's conditions. We may answer with Zaccaria that this doubt of St. Hilary may be taken as rather oratorical than practical; that also there would have been some room for it, practically speaking, since the cruelty of Constantius in exiling the Pope was well matched by his wickedness in accompanying the liberation with a false rumor as to his defection. But we can account also for the saying of Hilary, if we reflect upon the outrageous decree of the Emperor that thereafter the government of the Church should be administered in common by Liberius and Felix. Such an abominable fashion of withdrawing from the difficulty that he himself had effected, might well cause Constantius to seem to the saint equally guilty in the exile and the pardon. As for the *Fragments* attributed to the holy bishop of Poitiers, they are forgeries. In the first place, a clear evidence of falsehood is shown in two of the alleged letters of Liberius herein quoted. They are the epistles beginning "Studious of peace" and "Because I know you." In these, Liberius is made to say that from the very commencement of his reign he had condemned Athanasius, and all authentic documents show that for a long time he was the most strenuous defender of the persecuted bishop. But all these *Fragments* are to be rejected. The sentiments contained in them are opposed to those found in the saint's authentic writings; they give everything which might

militate for the Pontiff's alleged Arianism, but say nothing of his celebrated orthodox letter. Rufinus declares himself dubious as to the defection of our Pope; now if he knew anything of the existence of these *Fragments*, he would not have been doubtful, and he says nothing of them. St. Jerome enumerates the works of Hilary, but is silent as to the *Fragments* (1).

As for the testimony of St. Jerome, expressly stating that Liberius signed an heretical formula, we may answer with Palma that it is allowable in matters of history to sometimes differ from even this great doctor. But it is far from certain that the *Chronicle* has come down to us uninterpolated; indeed, we have the testimony of Menochius that nothing pointing to a fall of Liberius is contained in the Christina MSS. of the Vatican, and that is certainly of the sixth or seventh century (2). Literary forgery was easier in the days of copyists than it is in our time, and the olden heretics were much addicted to the use of this weapon. Origen, Athanasius, and others were often put to trouble by these gentry; the first, indeed, owes to them the greater part, if not all, the suspicion as to his orthodoxy. What more natural then than to suppose the audacious Arians guilty of falsifying, in the case of so important a witness as St. Jerome? If our adversaries are unwilling to accept our supposition, as the only way of accounting for the singular and absolutely isolated position among all Catholic writers of antiquity, in which they place St. Jerome, we can only say that he was deceived, and that his sole opinion should not militate against the many positive arguments to the contrary. As for the accusation against Fortunatianus, taken from the book of the saint on *Ecclesiastical Authors*, Palma regards it as a proof that also this work of the great doctor has been mutilated. For, he argues, Fortunatianus would not have urged the Pontiff to encourage a heresy which he himself detested. Be this as it may, we may apply to our own use the answer which Alexandre gives to those who adduce this passage of St. Jerome to prove that Liberius must have signed the second (plainly heretical) formula of

(1) *Acts of the Bollandists*, Sept. 23.

(2) BARTHELEMY, *Errors*.

Sirrius. Believing that the Pope subscribed the first of the three formulas, the Gallican historian says that St. Jerome might well have blamed Fortunatianus for inducing Liberius to sign a formula in which the word *Homoousion*, which was regarded as a test of orthodoxy, was omitted, and for having brought about the condemnation of Athanasius; it by no means follows from this passage, he insists, that St. Jerome believed the Pontiff to have signed an expressly heretical document.

As to the "*Acts of Eusebius*," they were discovered in the fifteenth century, and were believed by Bossuet to be genuine. They purport to be a narrative of the martyrdom of a holy priest who suffered with the consent of the late convert to Arianism, our Pontiff Liberius. But these "*Acts*" show themselves to be of no value, since they speak of a dialogue between the Pope and Constantius in the year 359, and we know that the latter left Rome in 358, and never entered it again.

And what of the *Pontifical Book*? In the first place, Muratori holds that this Diary of the Popes, as it may be styled, was not begun until the eighth century. If this opinion be correct, we must deny the *Book* any value in the premises. At any rate, there are so many contradictions in the chapter from which the adverse testimony is taken, that we can place no reliance upon it, and must suppose at least that part to be an Arian forgery. Thus, it is said that Liberius was paroned by Constantius, but that he dared not enter Rome until he had made his peace with the Emperor through the intercession of Constantia. It is said too that the matter of dissension between the Pope and the Emperor was the question of rebaptism, a subject some time forgotten. We also read of an interview between Constantius and Liberius in the year 359, while the former was warring in Pannonia against the Sarmatians. We are told that the ex-intruder Felix died a natural death, but we know that he became a martyr to the faith.

Having now done justice to the arguments of our opponents, we would, before commencing our positive defence of Liberius, ask what would be the conclusion if all that has

been alleged were acknowledged as true. Alexandre and some others will answer that even in this case, it could not be held that the Pontiff became a heretic, for the formula which he signed (if he signed any) was tenable, though it omitted the "Homoousion;" that even if he did condemn the saintly Athanasius, that would have been cowardice and not heresy. But the majority of those who strive so eagerly to besmirch the memory of Liberius, go further than Alexandre to obtain a *de facto* proof that the Roman Pontiff is not, by divine appointment, an infallible teacher. Now all their arguments go to show, first, that Liberius yielded to violence; second, that his conduct was that of a personal coward, not that of one wishing to teach the Universal Church—they prove, that is, nothing against the Catholic doctrine of Papal Infallibility.

But we propose to proceed further in this matter than a mere refutation of the Gallican and Protestant theories. It is admitted by all that Liberius was faithful up to the year 358, and the sole praise of his successor, Damasus, is enough to show that in his last years he was free from heretical taint. If any unworthy concessions purchased for him the privilege of returning to his See, we should find some allusions to them in those authors who treat of that return. But these writers furnish testimony to his innocence. Thus, Sulpicius Severus, in his *Sacred History*, b. 2, c. 49, says: "Liberius, bishop of Rome, and Hilarius, bishop of Poitiers, are exiled. . . . but Liberius is soon restored to the city *on account of the seditions of the Romans*." Socrates tells us, b. 2, c. 37, that "Not long afterwards, Liberius was recalled from exile, and resumed his chair, when the Roman people, having risen in rebellion, had expelled Felix, and the Emperor, *although unwilling*, had given his assent." But Theodoret speaks still more plainly in his *History*, b. 2, c. 15, where he narrates how the Roman senators sent their wives to Constantius as suppliants for the return of the Pope. Thus the nobles argued: "He may not forgive us who are men, but if you women entreat him, he may pardon you." The Emperor received their request, but answered that the Roman See was not a widow, since it had Felix for a spouse.

To this the matrons replied that the Roman citizens would not enter the church while Felix was in it, because though he himself held the faith of Nice, yet he communicated with those who did not hold it. "Then," continues Theodoret, "the Emperor being touched, he ordered that illustrious and praiseworthy man to come out of exile, and both (that is, Liberius and Felix) to administer the Church in common. When this epistle was read in the circus, the people exclaimed that the Emperor's decree was just. But the spectators soon divided into two factions. . . . one declaring for this Bishop, the other for that. . . . then with one voice all cried out, 'One God, One Christ, One Bishop.' After these acclamations of the most Christian people, full of piety and justice, the admirable Liberius returned." This conclusive testimony of Severus, Socrates, and Theodoret, is confirmed by Cassiodorus in the fifth book of his *Tripartite History*. That these four grave historians were well acquainted with the events of the fourth century, no one will deny, and their testimony will bear more to our point, if we consider with the learned Stilting (1) that it is very unlikely that the Arians and Semiarians would have omitted to sustain their cause by quoting any lapse in their favor made by a Roman Pontiff. They seized with avidity upon the fall of the unfortunate Hosius; would they have ignored that of his master? Not one of the many Greek or Latin fathers, who flourished in such number in the centuries immediately following Liberius, alludes to any fall, either directly, or by excuse of it, or by asserting his repentance.

A strong argument for the constancy of the Pontiff is found in the manner of his treatment of the Council of Rimini, held in 359. The fathers of this synod accepted a Profession of Faith which was Catholic in the letter, but which the usual frauds of the Arians easily perverted to a comfort of heresy. Liberius condemned their action, and only pardoned them on condition that they should condemn the accepted Profession, issue one conformable to that of Nice, and cease all communication with the Arians. We find in Socrates (2) an epistle of the Pontiff to the Orientals, in which he says :

(1) BOLLANDISTS, *Sept.* 23, § 9.(2) *Book* 4, c. 12.

"For very nearly all of those who were then assembled at Rimini, and were deceived, partly by seduction, and partly by fraud, are now returned to a healthy state of mind, and have anathematized the formula of faith issued by the Council of Rimini, and have subscribed to the form of Catholic and Apostolic faith once edited at Nice; and having entered into our communion, they are now moved by the greatest indignation against the doctrine of Arius and his disciples." Such words are not consistent with the supposition that the writer himself had been guilty, but a few months before, of the same, if not a greater crime.

Of no light weight is the argument drawn from the affection of the Roman people for Liberius, for both the clergy and the laity of Rome were intensely hostile to Arianism and devoted to Athanasius. Sozomenus says, in his *History*, book 4, c. 15, "The Roman people loved Liberius without measure, as a man in every sense illustrious, and one who, for the sake of religion, had bravely resisted the emperor." And Theodoret, in book 2, c. 27, says of the intruder Felix that "He preserved entire and inviolate the formula of faith drawn up by the Nicene fathers. But with those who tainted it, he freely communicated, and for that reason none of the Roman citizens entered the church while he was inside." Would not this affectionate admiration for Liberius have ceased, if he had made shipwreck of his faith, of that faith of Nice which they so jealously cherished? They twice drove Felix from the city for merely communicating with heretics, and they continued to love him who had acknowledged and professed the heresy itself?

The reader will have noticed that the heart of the Liberian controversy lies in the Pontiff's subscription to one of the formulas of faith drawn up at Sirmium. It is now proper for us to see to which one of these documents the Pontiff put his name, if indeed he signed any one of them, and to discover its nature. Baronius holds that all three of the formulas in question were edited in the Sirmian synod of 351, held against Photinus, but Nicholas Faber (1) and Alexandre prove that only the first one was issued by

(1) *Preface to FRAGM. of St. Hilary.*

that synod. The second document saw the light in the year 357, and the third in the year 359. The first formula sins by omission, as all that it contains is Catholic, but it lacks the "*Homœousios*;" the second is unmitigatedly Arian, the third is Semiarian. We propose to show that Liberius could not possibly have signed the second or third; that therefore the first, if any whatever, should claim our attention. Pagi and Valois hold that the Pope subscribed the third formula; the following reasons will show they are mistaken: Firstly, Valois himself holds (1) that the third synod of Sirmium was celebrated in the year 359, in the consulship of Eusebius and Hypatius, and that Marcus Arethusius drew up the formula. But the one (if any) signed by Liberius is the one to which the sixth *Fragment* of Hilary alludes as "that perfidy of Sirmium which Liberius calls Catholic," and which was drawn by many bishops whose names are given. Again, this third formula did not appear until the year 359, and Liberius had been pardoned the year previous. How then could this document be connected with his restoration to freedom? Nor did he sign the second formula, for the reason that its profession of Arianism was so patent, so void of mystification, that no possible art could have cleansed the signer of the stain of heresy. In case the Pontiff had signed that document, there would have been no room for doubt as to his crime, and our opponents must admit that there are some points indicating his innocence. But we are not wanting in reasons extraneous to the nature of the paper. It is not likely, says Alexandre, that Liberius signed that formula which Constantius himself had condemned, through the agency of Basil of Ancyra. The Pontiff was called to Sirmium after the Anomœans (2) had been driven from Antioch by the Emperor, and when already the second formula had been thrust aside as a hideous abortion. Again, we know from the book *on Synods* of Hilary that, excepting the avowed Arians, the unfortunate Hosius was the only one to accept this formula. And the document which Li-

(1) *Notes to SOZOMENUS*, b. 2, c. 30.

(2) The Anomœans were the ultra Arians, who held that the Son was *anomoios*, dissimilar to the Father. Their leader was Aetius.

berius is said to have signed was subscribed by twenty-two bishops, all Orientals, while the second formula was drawn by Western prelates, as we learn from Athanasius, Socrates, and Hilary. This formula bears the names of Hosius and Potamius, while that attributed to the Pope makes no mention of these bishops. Finally, among the signers of the document assigned to Liberius are numbered Theodore of Heraclea, Basil of Ancyra, and Silvan of Tarsus, all of whom must be excluded from any connection with this second formula: Theodore (1), because he died two years ere it was issued; the others because at the very worst, they were Semiarians, and detested those Anomœan errors which are found in it.

There remains, therefore, only the first formula, promulgated in the year 351, to which Liberius could possibly have subscribed. If this is examined, the charge of heresy, which is brought against the Pontiff, must fall to the ground. It reads as follows: "We believe in One God, the Father Almighty, creator and maker of all things, in whom all pater-nity is in Heaven, and is named on earth. And in His Only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, generated before all ages from God the Father, light from light, through whom were made all things in Heaven and on earth invisible as well as visible; He is the Word and Wisdom, true light and life, and in the later days was made Man and was born of the Holy Virgin, crucified, dead, and buried; He sits at the right hand of the Father, and is to come at the end of time to judge the living and the dead, and will render to each one according to his works; whose Kingdom never-ending will last for infinite ages; He sits at the right hand of the Father, not only in this time, but in the future. And in the Holy Ghost, that is, the Paraclete, whom, having promised Him to the apostles, after His ascent to Heaven He sent to teach them and to advise them in all things. Through whom are sanctified all souls which sincerely believe in Him." Now, although the word *Homoousios* is not found in this profession, yet there is nothing in it repugnant to the Catholic doctrine on the divinity of the Word. The omission should not have

(1) THEODORET. *b.* 2 *c.* 16.

been allowed, for an insertion of the term "Consubstantial" was regarded by the orthodox as a safeguard to the true faith. But all those who omitted it were not regarded, in the time of Athanasius, as necessarily heretical. There never was a more strenuous defender of the word *Homoousios* than the holy bishop of Alexandria, and yet he says in his book on *Synods*, No. 41, "It is not right to regard as enemies those who accept all the other Nicene writings, and hesitate only as to the word 'Consubstantial' . . . . . for we dispute as brothers with brothers, who are of the same opinion as ourselves, bringing a name alone into controversy. For when they avow that the Son is from the substance of the Father, and from no other substance; that He is not a creature or a thing made, but a genuine and real Son, the Word and Wisdom, existing one with the Father, they are not far from receiving the term "Consubstantial."

And now we may conclude our dissertation on the orthodoxy of the holy Liberius. We have seen that the arguments against him are not tenable, that there is abundant positive evidence in his favor, and that if he signed any one of the Sirmian formulas, it was one which was innocent of heresy. As the opinion of the Greek Church in this matter may be of interest to some, we will finish with a quotation from the ancient *Menology*, a liturgical book in use in both the United and Schismatic Churches, and corresponding to the Roman *Martyrology*. At the date of Sept. 27th, we read, "The blessed Liberius, defender of the truth, was bishop of Rome while Constantius was Emperor. His zeal caused him to defend the great Athanasius . . . . . afterwards, Liberius contended with all his might against the malice of the heretics, and was exiled to Beræa in Thrace. But the Romans, who loved and venerated him, were faithful to him and entreated the Emperor to restore him. He returned to Rome, where he governed his flock in wisdom and died."

With the question of the fall or innocence of Pope Liberius is intimately connected the controversy as to the place due to Felix, the occupant of the Papal chair during the exile of the former. Bellarmine, Baronio, and a few others, contend that he was, at least for a time, a legitimate Pon-

tiff, and hence they style him Felix II. Papebroch and Zaccaria hold that Felix was a vicar of Liberius. Christian Lupus, Dupin, Alexandre, Tillemont, and Orsi, place him among the Anti-Popes, and it is difficult to refute their arguments. If there was any time when Felix was a legitimate Pontiff, it was when Liberius was in exile, and only then, because Liberius had abdicated. But nothing in history is more certain than that Liberius never abdicated ; and if he had done so, Felix should have become his successor in a legitimate manner, and not through the intrigues of the Arians and the violence of Constantius. Nor can an argument for the legitimacy of the claims of Felix be deduced from the fact that some of the ancient records number him among the saints. Granting that he is not confounded, in these documents, with Pope St. Felix I., it does not follow, because he became a saint, that he was never an Anti-Pope. Upon the return of the legitimate Pontiff, he may have repented of his usurpation, and during his last years of life, while, as Philostorgius says (1), "he retained the dignity of bishop, but governed no church," he may have advanced to heroic sanctity.

---

## CHAPTER XXI.

### THE COUNCIL OF RIMINI.

In the year 358, the emperor Constantius endeavored to put an end to the dissensions of the Eastern Church, by calling a synod at Nicomedia. This city, however, being devastated by an earthquake, Nice was chosen as the place of meeting. Another earthquake prevented, as Theodoret thinks (2), the Arians from desecrating, as the event proved, the city where was issued the great decree upon the Divinity of Christ. In 359, therefore, a Council was ordered to assemble

(1) *History*, b. 4, n. 5.

(2) "God, who does not cease to protect His Church, would not have the Council held here, lest the Arians should take advantage of the name of the place, and by styling the Synod Nicene, should circumvent simple minds." *Hist.*, b. 2, c. 26.

at Rimini in the Romagna, but by the advice of the Arians, the Eastern bishops left Rimini to the Westerns, and betook themselves to Seleucia, in Isauria. St. Athanasius tells us, in his book on *Synods*, that four hundred bishops met at Rimini (1). Julianus Pelagianus (2) puts the number at six hundred and fifty, but St. Athanasius is the more reliable of the two authors, and is corroborated by good authority. When the prelates had met, Valens and Ursacius, obstinate Arians, brought forth the third formula of Sirmium, in which the Son was declared, according to the Scriptures, similar to the Father, and asked the Council to approve of it, as it pleased the emperor. The bishops rejected it, and deemed it sufficient to declare their reception of the Nicene Creed. Ursacius, Valens, Germinius, Auxentius, Caius, and Demophilus, were then condemned as heretics (3). Ursacius and Valens now visited Constantius, and so worked upon his Arian sympathies that when the Council's messengers waited upon him for license for the prelates to depart to their homes, he refused to receive them. He had too much to attend to; he was preparing for a campaign against the Barbarians; when he was at leisure, he would listen to them. But if he trusted that the bishops would become tired out, and would reconsider their condemnation of Ursacius and his companions in heresy, he was mistaken, for all the synodals sent him word that they had instructed their legates to inform him that their decision was final (4). When Constantius received this message, he caused several bishops to be taken to Nice in Thrace, and there, some out of simplicity, and others from fear, they were induced to sign a formula only differing from the third of Sirmium in that it declared the Son "similar to the Father in all things," while that of Sirmium presented the Son as "similar to the Father who begat Him, according to the Scriptures." This Thracian formula was then offered to the fathers of Rimini, and they signed it. On account of this action, they have sometimes

(1) In his *Epistle to the Africans*, Athanasius says two hundred, but Baronio thinks that this document has been corrupted..

(2) In St. Augustine : *Imperfect Work*, b. 1, c. 73.

(3) SOCRATES : b. 2, c. 29. THEODORET, b. 2, c. 18. SOZOMENUS ; b. 4, c. 16.

(4) *Ibi*.

been accused of heresy, and we now proceed to inquire into the justice of the accusation.

The following, according to St. Jerome (1), is from the Profession of Faith given in the *Acts* of the Council of Rimini, to which the members subscribed: "We believe in one true God, the Father Almighty. We also believe this. We believe in the only-begotten Son of God, who was born before all ages; born the only-begotten of God the Father alone, God from God, similar to the Father according to the Scriptures; whose nativity no one knows, but the Father who begat Him." St. Jerome then continues his own remarks: "Was it here inserted that there was a time when He was not, or that the Son of God is a creature? The perfect faith is the belief that He is God from God. And they said that He was born, the only-begotten from the Father alone. What means 'born'? Certainly not 'made.' Nativity removes a suspicion of His being a creature. They also added: 'Who descended from heaven, was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day He arose from the dead, He ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, to come to judge the living and the dead.' The words sounded piously, and amidst so much honey of praise, no one suspected any insertion of poison. . . . For the rejection of the word *ousia*, a plausible reason was given, that it is not found in the Scriptures, and it scandalizes the more simple by its novelty; the bishops cared not for the word, if the meaning were safe. But at last, in the course of time, when popular rumor had it that a fraud had been practised in the Profession, Valens, bishop of Mursia, who had written it in the presence of Taurus, the Pretorian prefect, who was at the synod by order of the emperor, declared that he was not an Arian, and that he detested their blasphemies. The secrecy of the thing had not destroyed the popular opinion. And hence, another day, in the church of Rimini, many bishops and a crowd of laics being present, Musonius, a Byzantine prelate, whose age gave him honor among all, spoke thus: 'Let one of us read to your Holinesses the common

(1) *Dialogue against the Luciferians.*

reports which have reached us, that the evil things, which ought to be abhorrent to our ears and hearts, may be unanimously condemned.' All the bishops replied: 'It pleases.' And then when Claude, a Picene bishop, had begun to read the blasphemies which rumor ascribed to Valens, this prelate denied that they were his, and cried out: 'If any one denies that Christ is God, the Son of God, and born of the Father before the ages, let him be anathema.' And all answered: 'Anathema.' 'If any one denies that the Son is similar to the Father, according to the Scriptures, let him be anathema.' And all replied: 'Anathema.' 'If any one says that the Son is not eternal with the Father, let him be anathema.' All called 'Anathema.' 'If any one says the Son of God is a creature, like other creatures, let him be anathema.' In the same way was cried 'Anathema.' 'If any one says the Son is not from God the Father, let him be anathema.' All exclaimed 'Anathema.' If any one says there was a time when the Son was not, let him be anathema.' At this, all the bishops, and the entire audience, with great joy and applause, saluted the words of Valens. If any one deems this a fiction of ours, let him examine the public archives; the records of the churches are full, and the memory of these things is recent. Men yet survive who were at that synod, and to confirm the truth, the very Arians do not deny that the proceedings were as we have said. While then all were extolling Valens to the skies, and were condemning and repenting of their suspicion of him, the same Claude, who had begun to read, said: 'There yet remain a few words which have escaped my lord and brother Valens, which, if you please, that no scruple may remain, we will together condemn. If any one says that the Son of God was indeed before all ages, but not so before all time, that nothing was before Him, let him be anathema.' And all said: 'Anathema.' And many other things which seemed suspicious, after Claude pronounced them, Valens condemned. If any one desires to learn more, he will find them in the Acts of the Synod of Rimini, from which we have drawn the above. These things done, the Council was dissolved, and all return joyful to their prov-

inces . . . . But crimes are not long hidden, and a badly-healed wound opens again. Afterwards Valens, Ursacius, and other of the companions in iniquity, illustrious priests of Christ, commenced to clap their hands, saying they had not denied that the Son was a creature, and that he was like unto other creatures . . . . There were certain bishops, deceived by the snares of Rimini, who when they were unwittingly regarded as heretics, protested by the Body of the Lord, and by all that is holy in the Church, that they had suspected no evil in the Profession. ‘We thought,’ said they, ‘that its sense agreed with its words; nor did we fear that in the Church of God, where there is a pure Confession, one thing would be expressed by the lips, and another be hidden in the heart. We were deceived by our good opinion of evil men; we did not think that priests of Christ would combat against Him.’ And weeping, they said much more, which, for brevity, I omit; they were prepared to sign the old Profession, and to condemn all the Arian blasphemies.” This testimony of St. Jerome abundantly proves that the fathers of Rimini signed a Profession of Faith which was, in itself, orthodox; that when they discovered the fraud of Valens and Ursacius, they condemned Arianism and the Arians.

The same fact is evinced from the following passage of the historian, Sulpicius Severus (1): “The emperor forced our legates to the synod of Rimini to join the heretical communion, and gave them a Profession drawn up by the wicked, one couched in deceiving terms, which presented Catholic truth, while perfidy was latent. For, lest the Son should be believed to be of the same substance with the Father, they abolished, under a false species of reasoning, the word *ousia*, as ambiguous and rashly adopted by the Fathers, and not authorized by the Scriptures. The same Profession declared the Son similar to the Father, but there was the fraud prepared, that He should be similar, not equal. . . . Valens, as though he were helping our cause, added a sentence in which there was a hidden trap, namely, that the Son of God was not a creature like other creatures. For in those words,

(1) *History*, b. 2.

in which the Son is declared not like other creatures, He is nevertheless pronounced a creature, although more powerful than the rest."

St. Augustine indeed informs us that the Arian poison infected many at the Council of Rimini, but he attributes the calamity of the fallen prelates to their simplicity: "Because they were of little intelligence, and were so deluded by obscure language, that they thought the Arians believed as they believed" (1). He adds that some yielded to fear, but that they immediately recovered their strength. St. Hilary uses similar language (2).

There certainly are some pretty strong passages in the writings of certain Fathers, which seem to affix the mark of heresy upon the bishops of Rimini. Thus, Liberius (3), Basil (4), Ambrose (5), and Facundus (6), present isolated remarks which, at first sight, would indicate a belief that these prelates were formally guilty. But when these Fathers, in this connection, speak of Arian poison and of Arian dogma, they allude either to the Arian communion, to which the deceived prelates temporarily adhered, or to that insidious Profession which the Arians had arranged for the implicit defence of their heresy. These Fathers believed with Facundus (7) that "a heretic is not made by that ignorance which is not contumacious to true doctrine, but by that which is an obstinate defence of falsehood." There is one passage of St. Jerome (8), however, which demands more than casual notice: "Then was abolished the word *ousia*; then was acclaimed the condemnation of the Nicene Faith. The whole world groaned, and wondered to find itself Arian." This hyperbolic saying of the great doctor does not necessarily mean that the bishops of Rimini voted the entire discontinuance of the word *ousia*; that they rejected that Nicene Faith which they had hitherto professed and afterwards acclaimed; that the entire world had abandoned the orthodox faith. The saint is indignant because of the suppression of a word which was a great obstacle to Arian

(1) *Epist.* 48.

(2) *Epist. to the Eastern Bishops.*

(3) *Epist.* 11 to the Easterns.

(4) *Epist.* 52, to Athanasius.

(5) *On St. Luke*, c. 6.

(6) *Book* 5, c. 3.

(7) *B.* 12, c. 1.

(8) *Dialogue against the Luciferians.*

progress; the Nicene Faith was joyfully rejected, not at Rimini, but after the synod there held, and by the Arians who boasted that the Catholic bishops had agreed with them in their Profession; the whole world could not have been Arian, when even the fathers of Rimini were not Arian. St. Athanasius testifies (1) that these prelates, impelled by the laudable desire of peace, subscribed to a Profession which was apparently orthodox. As for the last clause of St. Jerome's rhetorical passage, we know that there were far more Catholics than Arians in the world. The peoples of Alexandria, Constantinople, Antioch, Samosata, and Milan, resisted with all their might the intrusion of Arian bishops in those sees. The immense numbers of monks and hermits, who almost robbed the Egyptian desert of its name, were, according to Athanasius, ardent defenders of the Nicene Creed. St. Basil (2) testifies that the immense majority of Christians were orthodox; Socrates (3) and Sozomenus (4) say that the Westerns, generally speaking, hated Arianism, while in the East the disaffection was principally confined to the use of the word "consubstantial." Although so closely dependent upon the emperors, the very soldiers, according to Theodoret (5), were Catholic; so much so, that Julian, at the beginning of his reign, dared not openly show his hostility to the faith. St. Athanasius says to the emperor Jovian (6): "Know then, most religious Augustus, that this is the faith, professed by the Fathers congregated at Nice, with which agree all the churches of the earth; those of Spain, Britain, and the Gauls; those of all Italy, Dalmatia, Dacia, Moesia, Macedonia, and all Achaia; all those of Egypt and Lybia, of Pontus, Cappadocia, and the neighboring regions; all those, also, of the East, excepting a few who follow the opinion of Arius. . . . Although a certain few contradict this faith, we know, most religious Augustus, that they are of no prejudice to the entire world." Lucifer of Cagliari thus urges the Arian emperor Constantius (7): "If

(1) *Epistle to Rufinian.*(4) *B. 3, c. 12.*(2) *To the Neo-Cæsareans, 72 and 75.*(5) *B. 3, c. 3.*(3) *B. 2, c. 22.*(6) *Synodical Epistle on Faith, in Theodoret, b. 4, c. 2.*(7) *We Should Die for the Son of God.*

you could go among all the nations, you would find, most obstinate emperor, that everywhere the Christians believe as we do, that they persist in this faith, and like us, desire to die for the Son of God. But this new preaching, this recent religion, this blasphemy uttered by you, to the detriment of your salvation, has not only been unable to progress beyond the Roman confines, with all your efforts, but wherever it has tried to fix its roots, it has withered." It is evident, therefore, that the quoted passage of St. Jerome must be regarded as hyperbolical.

---

## CHAPTER XXII.

### SECOND GENERAL COUNCIL ; FIRST OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

This Council was called to take action against the heresies of Macedonius and Apollinaris, and to put an end to troubles in the churches of Constantinople and Antioch. Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople, successively an Arian and a Semiarian, finally denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, asserting that He is not of the same substance as the Father and the Son. Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, taught that Christ took from Mary a body without a soul ; that then He assumed a soul, but one wanting mind, the Divine Word taking the place of mind and intellect. He erred also in his doctrine as to the flesh of our Lord, for he held that the Word and flesh were one and the same substance, since the "Word was made flesh ;" that is, he taught, something of the Word was changed into flesh, and the flesh of Christ was not taken from that of Mary. Against these two heresies the Council took immediate action. Its sessions commenced in May, 381, and lasted until the end of July. At first, Meletius of Antioch was its president, but, dying during the synod, he was succeeded by St. Gregory of Nazianzen. This latter abdicating his see of Constantinople, Timothy of Alexandria was called to the

head of the Council, and finally the presiding chair was given to Nectarius, the successor of St. Gregory Nazianzen. The synod was attended by a hundred and fifty bishops, all Orientals. In the beginning it did not possess the authority of an Œcumenical Council, for it was convoked by the emperor Theodosius, and to it the Occidental prelates were not invited; but the character of œcumenicity was affixed to it when its acts were confirmed by the Holy See. This occurred, in regard to its Symbol and its definitions of faith, shortly after the Pontificate of Gelasius; but its canons were not accepted in the West for some time afterwards. St. Gregory the Great (el. 590) says: "The Roman Church does not as yet hold, nor has she accepted, the canons and acts of this Synod; but she has received that which was defined against Macedonius."

Before their separation the fathers of this Council wrote to Pope Damasus, relating their acts in regard to faith and discipline, and asking that he and the Western bishops "would rejoice with them, . . . . . that when the Word of God shall be established by common consent and Christian charity be confirmed among us, we may cease to say 'I am of Apollo, and I of Cephas.'" From this passage Bossuet (1) concludes that the Constantinopolitan prelates held that the assertion of a dogma of faith is to be sought, not in a Pontifical definition, or approbation, but in the common consent of the bishops. But the passage of St. Gregory above quoted shows that the Pope considered his authority as superior to the decrees of the Council. However, as this may be regarded as inconclusive, we adduce the testimony of the Sixth General Council. Although in the Second Œcumenical Council Pope Damasus was present, neither in person nor through his legates, yet the fathers of the Sixth Council declared that to him was principally due the destruction of Macedonianism. This could only have been by the posterior confirmation of the anti-Macedonian decrees, by which they obtained an irrefragable authority. The Council, in its eighteenth *Action*, uses the following language: "Macedonius denied the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, but

(1) *Defence of the Declaration*, . 12, c. 3.

the great emperor Theodosius, and Damasus, the adamant of faith, whose strong mind was not to be affected by the attacks of outside sects, and Gregory and Nectarius, brought together that Synod in the imperial city." For what other reason could these fathers of the Sixth Council have styled Damasus "the adamant of faith" in connection with Macedonius, than that of his confirmation of the decrees condemning that heretic? They knew that without that confirmation the decrees were null. They agreed, in fine, with the prelates whom Damasus united in Synod at Rome to confer upon the lately held Council of Rimini, who said that, "The number of the bishops who were collected at Rimini can have no influence. . . . for neither the Roman bishop, whose sentence before all others should have been awaited," &c. If then the Constantinopolitan fathers asked for the consent of Pope Damasus, they did so, not in accordance with the theory of Bossuet, because they deemed common consent desirable in definitions of faith, but because they knew that without the concurrence of the Pontiff their decrees were of no value. Bossuet himself cites a passage from Sozomenus, b. 6, c. 21, showing how, when Pope Liberius had defined that the Holy Ghost is Consubstantial with the other Divine Persons, the opponents "rested their cause, as the controversy was ended by the judgment of the Roman Church, and the question was seen to be terminated." If it was the belief of those times that only the consent of the various churches could put an end to controversies of faith, as the Gallicans once held, how could the sole decision of Rome terminate this one?

One of the most important acts of the Second General Council was the addition, by way of explanation, of several clauses to the Nicene Creed. First, to the clause "maker of all things visible and invisible" was added "of heaven and earth" against the Marcionites, and the Manicheans, who asserted the doctrine of two Principles. Secondly, was inserted "born before all ages," to combat the teaching of Photinus that the Word was not eternal but temporal, having an origin in the womb of Mary, and in the man Christ. Thirdly, the heresy of Apollinaris caused the introduction

of "by the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary." Fourthly, where the Nicene Creed reads only "suffered," the sixth synod inserted the words "was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and was buried." It also added, "He sitteth at the right hand of the Father," and "He is to come again in glory." And as Apollinaris taught the doctrine of the millennial reign of Christ, and to Marcellus of Ancyra was imputed the assertion that Christ would one day surrender His kingdom to the Father, and then be reduced to the order of the just, the Council wrote "of whose kingdom there shall be no end." Fifthly, to further confound the Macedonian errors as to the Holy Ghost, was introduced the passage from "Lord and Life-Giver" to "the holy prophets." Sixthly, was added the concluding clause, beginning with "and in one Holy, Catholic Church," and terminating with the "Amen." As to the assertion, made by some, that Pope Damasus added the celebrated clause "*Filioque*," "And from the Son," to the Constantinopolitan Creed, there is no foundation whatever for it (1). In the Roman Church, this addition was probably made in the time of Pope Nicholas I (858), as we gather from the Encyclical sent by the heresiarch Photius to the Orientals. Finally, in the second Council of Lyons (1274), the phrase was solemnly sung thrice in the Creed by both Greeks and Latins, but by special indult the former were permitted to omit it in their churches; and in the Council of Florence (1439), when the dogma of the Procession of the Holy Ghost was confirmed, the Universal Church approved of the addition.

The Second General Council issued only three canons, as is shown by Dionysius the Little, and by the synodical epistle sent in 382 by Nectarius to Pope Damasus. The seven canons contained in the collection of Isidore *Mercator* are in substance our three; the first corresponds to our first; the second, third, fourth, and fifth, form our second; the sixth is our third; the seventh is not properly a canon, as it is the Symbol of Faith. Of these canons, the third alone is of special interest to us. In it the fathers decreed, "Let the bishop of Constantinople have the primacy of honor

(1) ALEXANDRE; 4th Cent., diss. 37, art. 3.

after the Roman bishop, because that city is the younger Rome." By this canon, which gave to a bishop, hitherto subject to Alexandria, the patriarchal dignity, and jurisdiction over all the Thracian, Pontian, and Asiatic dioceses, a radical revolution was wrought in Oriental discipline; and while it could but be received with joy by the Constantinopolitans, it must have weighed heavily upon the hearts of the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, the former being now relegated to the third seat in the hierarchy, and the latter to the fourth. A see which, fifty years before, had been a modest member of the provincial synod of Heraclea, found itself now raised to a position second only to that of Rome. The Roman Pontiffs, ever zealous for the rights of each and all of the churches, for a long time resisted the encroachments authorized by this third canon, and only recognized it when the entire East was willing, nay desired, that it should be acknowledged. In the year 418, Pope Boniface I. thus reprov'd Atticus, bishop of Constantinople, for his arrogance in lording it over the bishop of Alexandria: "I leave it to your Fraternity to better understand who is master in humility, who in pride. But be it far removed from the priests of the Lord that any of them fall into the guilt of contemning the example of the fathers by any new usurpation. . . . If circumstances require, you can discover, by searching the canons, which is, after the Roman Church, the second see, which the third. Let the aforesaid great churches of Alexandria and Antioch preserve the dignity granted them by the canons, keeping a knowledge of ecclesiastical law." And Pope Sixtus III. (elect. 432), writing to the bishops of Illyria that they should not obey the bishop of Constantinople, said, "Do not deem yourselves bound, dear brothers, by those constitutions which the Oriental Synod willed to decree, against our commands; only in that (are you bound) which, with our consent, it adjudged concerning the faith." After the condemnation of Eutychianism in the Council of Chalcedon (451), when most of the fathers had left the city, a canon was rushed through, in spite of the protests of the Papal legates, confirming this third canon of Constantinople. Those who had signed the

canon endeavored, assisted by the emperor Marcian, to obtain the approbation of Pope Leo the Great, but in vain. All three of the Constantinopolitan canons were rejected in the Council of Chalcedon, for the Papal legates cried out, when an oriental codex containing them was introduced, "These canons are not found in the Synodical records." And for a long time afterwards the Supreme Pontiffs declared that the Church did not receive said canons. It is true that in the 16th *Action* of Chalcedon, Eusebius of Dorylæum, speaking of the third canon, says: "I have willingly subscribed, because in the city of Rome I read this regulation to the Most Holy Pontiff, in the presence of Constantinopolitan clerics, and he received it." But this prelate must have misunderstood the Pontiff, for St. Leo, in his epistle to Anatolius of Constantinople, declares the precise contrary. Pope Gelasius, addressing the bishops of Dardania, well accounts for the hesitancy of the Holy See to advance the see of Constantinople at the expense of the rights of Alexandria and Antioch. "If it is a question," he says, "of the dignity of the cities, certainly greater is the dignity of the priests of the second and third sees, than that of the priests of the city, which not only is not numbered among the (great) sees, but is not reckoned even among those having metropolitan rights. For if you call it the 'imperial city,' the power of the secular government is one thing, and the distribution of ecclesiastical dignities another." At length, in the fourth Council of Lateran, held under Pope Innocent III., in the year 1215, the Holy See recognized the right of Constantinople to the second place in the hierarchy. The fifth canon reads as follows: "Renewing the ancient privileges of the patriarchal sees, the holy universal Synod approving, we sanction that after the Roman Church, which, the Lord so disposing, holds the principality of ordinary power over all others as the Mother and Mistress of all the faithful of Christ, the Constantinopolitan church shall have the first place, the Alexandrian the second, the Antiochian the third, and that of Jerusalem the fourth, each one preserving its own dignity."

## CHAPTER XXIII.

### THE APPEAL OF ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM TO POPE INNOCENT I.

Among the many instances of appeal to Rome which are furnished by the olden records, our attention is especially challenged by that of St. John of the Golden Tongue, both on account of the eminent hierarchical position of the appellant, and because of his brilliant learning and indisputable sanctity. The great Chrysostom was bishop of Constantinople, of that see which in his time had already given signs of the overweening ambition which was one day to bring about both the spiritual and temporal wreck of Eastern Christendom. An appeal to the Roman Pontiff on the part of so exalted a prelate, and against the decision of so powerful a bishop as him of Alexandria, who was recognized as second in dignity to the Pope alone, cannot be very tasteful to gentry of the Cæsarean and Gallican schools, any more than to Protestants in general. Hence we find averse to an admission of such appeal Abp. De Marca (1), Dupin (2), and of course, Febronius (3). "The Romans," says this rehasher of old and already confuted arguments, "commencing with Pope Gelasius, conclude that Chrysostom appealed to Innocent," and then he proceeds to repeat the ideas of De Marca, Dupin, and the Protestant Basnage (4), the erroneousness of which he has seen demonstrated by David (5), by Alexandre (6), by Pagi, and by Christian Lupus (7). In his treatment of this subject, Zaccaria (8) avails himself copiously of the arguments adduced by the celebrated Franciscan controversialist, Bianchi (9), and we can do no better than imitate his example. But before entering upon an argumentative consideration of our question, it is well to speak briefly of the circumstances out of which it arose.

(1) *Concord of Priesthood and Empire*, b. 7, c. 9.

(2) *Ancient Discipline*, diss. 2, c. 2.

(6) *Fourth Cent.*, diss. 28.

(3) c. 5, § 8.

(7) *On Appeals*, diss. 1, c. 17.

(4) *Annals*.

(8) *Anti-Febronio*, p. 2, b. 3, c. 4.

(5) *Canonical Judgments*, c. 7. (9) *The External Polity of the Church*, l. 5, n. 2

When, in the year 398, St. John Chrysostom was chosen as their bishop by the clergy and people of Constantinople, Theophilus of Alexandria exerted all his influence, and descended to every species of chicanery, to prevent his accession to the episcopal dignity. But the emperor Arcadius so willing, Theophilus accorded the consecration, and the new prelate, then fifty-four years of age, entered upon a career which soon excited the admiration of the good and the hate of the wicked. The enmity of Theophilus proved long-lived, and it only wanted a suitable occasion to manifest itself in works. This occasion was furnished in the year 401, when the saint kindly received under his protection some Egyptian monks whom the Alexandrian bishop had persecuted. Chrysostom had also made many enemies among the rich and powerful by his eloquent outbursts against their arrogance and cruel injustice. Nor were all of the clergy friendly to him; his severity in upholding the canons created much excitement among the lovers of a relaxed discipline. But neither Theophilus the bishop, nor his allies, the eunuch Eutropius, and Gainas, a general of the army, could avail much against the holy prelate until the empress Eudoxia came to their aid. Chrysostom one day preached a severe sermon on the vanity and luxury to which many females of the capital were given in an extraordinary degree, and the discourse being represented to Eudoxia as directed especially against her imperial person, she resolved upon vengeance. Accordingly, in the month of June, 403, Theophilus held a synod in a suburb of Chalcedon, called "At the Oak," in which forty-five bishops hostile to the saint, presented false accusations, Chrysostom himself being absent. Theophilus rendered judgment of deposition, and the emperor followed up the sentence with a decree of exile: but under the combined influence of fear of the popular indignation, and of terror on account of an earthquake, Eudoxia relented, and obtained the restoration of the saint. But about eight months afterwards, a statue of Eudoxia was being dedicated alongside the church of St. Sophia, while divine service was being held within, and Chrysostom was so impressed with the incongruity, and the disrespect caused

by the noise of the accompanying games, that in his sermon he condemned the participators in, and the managers of the festivity. Then the smouldering fire burst out anew, and in June of 404 another synod was held, and the sentence of deposition renewed. Arsacius was intruded into the Constantinopolitan see, and Chrysostom exiled to Mt. Tarsus in the Lesser Armenia. So cunning were the persecutors of the saint, that even shrewd and learned men like Sts. Epiphanius and Jerome were deceived, and believed him in fault. His enemies tried to justify their conduct before Pope Innocent I., but when that Pontiff received an appeal from the persecuted bishop, he rescinded the iniquitous decree of deposition, and led the Western emperor, Honorius, to patronize Chrysostom's cause before his imperial brother, Arcadius. In the meantime, the saint had suffered much in his place of exile—almost a desert—and had been frequently in want of the necessaries of life. He dragged out an existence at Mt. Tarsus for three years, and then, having been ordered to Pithium in the Euxine, he started on the journey, but succumbed at Comana to the cruelties of his guards, and died Sept. 14, an. 407, in the sixty-third year of his age.

And now for St. Chrysostom's appeal to Pope Innocent I. We take it from Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, a bosom friend of the saint, who wrote a *Life* of him which may be read in the edition of his works prepared by the erudite Benedictine, Montfaucon, of the Congregation of St. Maur. After a narration of the proceedings of the synod "At the Oak," and of his restoration, Chrysostom tells the Pontiff how he sought for a hearing before a synod wherein his enemies would be present, but not as judges; he then speaks of his condemnation without a hearing, and of the violent occupation of his church on the night of Holy Saturday, and then comes to the point of his appeal: "In order that such confusion may not invade the whole earth which is under heaven, we pray you that by your letters you denounce those things which have been wickedly done against us by one of the parties (to the question), while we were absent, and not declining a trial; that they may not have any value, as indeed from their very nature they have none; and that

those who have dared such things, be subjected to the penalties of the ecclesiastical laws. Concede, therefore, to us, who have been neither convicted nor reprehended nor proved guilty, the enjoyment of your letters of communion, of your charity, and of all other things, as hitherto." If these words of Chrysostom do not constitute an appeal, it would be difficult to frame one less open to exception. But Febronius contends that this letter does not prove that the writer believed the Pope to be possessed of authority to rescind his condemnation, since the same missive was despatched to Venerius of Milan, and to Chromatius of Aquileia. It proves merely, concludes Febronius, that the saint invoked the moral influence of these Western prelates, of the Pope included, to be exercised by a disapprobation of a judgment irregularly given, and not by a nullifying action, which they were incompetent to put forth. This objection had already been made by Dupin, and in answering him, Bianchi furnishes our reply to Febronius. "We find," says Bianchi, "among the epistles of St. John Chrysostom, one to Chromatius of Aquileia, and one to Venerius of Milan. But these two letters were written in the year 406, as Montfaucon observes, that is, two years after the letter to Innocent. And again, there is not a shadow of similarity between them and the letter to the Pontiff. But it might be alleged in favor of Dupin, that at the end of the epistle to Innocent, as it is given to us by Palladius, is said, 'this same was written to Venerius, bishop of Milan, and to Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia.' But we may well answer that this clause was added by some interpolator of the codex of Palladius. For this assertion no trivial argument is found in the fact that the passage is not read in certain MSS. cited by Coustant; that it is wanting in all the editions of the works of Chrysostom; that it does not occur in the copy of the same letter added by Fronto Duceus to the epistles of the saint. . . . . But granted that Chrysostom sent to Venerius and Chromatius a copy of the letter which he had sent to Innocent, must we therefore conclude that he recognized in them the same authority that he acknowledged in the Pontiff? Not at all. These two bishops were the chief ones among the

Italian prelates forming the ordinary council of the Pope, with the aid of which council were decided by the Holy See the most important affairs of religion and of discipline. The many Councils held in Rome by Damasus with the intervention of St. Ambrose of Milan, and of the bishop of Aquileia, and the very Synod held by Innocent in the case of Chrysostom, leave no doubt as to the custom of the Pontiffs. It was quite natural then that, in appealing to Pope Innocent, the saint should write also to those two prelates who were then the only metropolitans in Italy, and should send them a copy of the letter to the Pontiff, in order that, if called to the Synod, they would be well informed as to the state of affairs. We must also observe that the four bishops, who formed the embassy of Chrysostom, were sent, not to Milan or to Aquileia, but directly to Rome, and with the letters not only of the saint, but also of the forty prelates who persevered in his communion. Innocent answered the letters of Chrysostom and those of the clergy of Constantinople, and only his answers were spread through the East."

So much for the letter; now as to its reception by Pope Innocent. As Palladius writes, the Pontiff reprobated the judgment of Theophilus, but Febronius answers that so did Venerius and Chromatius, and others, but not in a judicial manner. To this we reply that Palladius, speaking of this reprobation, uses the word *atheteo*, which word, besides its general significance of *reproving*, possesses also the sense of *abrogating, abolishing, cancelling* (1). That the sentence of Theophilus was really *cancelled* by Pope Innocent, was believed by Pope Gelasius, who wrote to the bishops of Dardania that the Apostolic See (*alone*, says the Pontiff) had absolved John of Constantinople, whom a Synod "even of Catholic prelates, had condemned." Such was the opinion of Pope Vigilius, who, in his *Constitution*, declares that neither Chrysostom nor Flavian could be cut off from the Church, because the Holy See adjudged them to be most firmly united to her. But according to Febronius, or rather Dupin, Pope Innocent himself confesses, in his letter to the clergy

(1) See Mansi's notes to Alexandre's 28th Dissertation, in *Fourth Century*.

of Constantinople, that a Synod was necessary for his judicial decision. "That alone," says the Pontiff, "will calm the waves of such tempests." Only ignorance of ecclesiastical law, or perhaps the passion of party, can excuse the proffering of such an objection. "We must observe," says Bianchi, "that although, regularly speaking, an appeal to a legitimate judge entails the suspensive act, that is, renders necessary an inquiry by the judge into the merits of the case, suspending the execution of the sentence, and placing the appellant in his pristine condition; sometimes, nevertheless, the sentence is not suspended. The cases of such non-suspension of execution are named, in both civil and ecclesiastical jurisprudence. Again, it is one thing to appeal from an unjust sentence of a competent judge, who has acted according to the proper mode of procedure, and quite another thing to appeal from a sentence which is null and void through defect of authority in the judge, or on account of a judicial error in the proceedings. In the first case, it may happen that the appeal may not entail the suspensive act, but never in the second. . . . Now, as the judgment pronounced against Chrysostom by the Eastern Synod was null because given by incompetent judges, because rendered in the absence of the accused, Innocent having accepted the appeal, and heard the ambassadors from each side, did first of all what legality demanded; he annulled the acts of Theophilus, and restored Chrysostom to his see, giving him the ecclesiastical communion, and with it, the possession of all his rights. But the Pontiff prudently abstained from any judgment, so to say, *in petitorio*, with regard to the truth or falsity of the accusations, reserving them to the consideration of a Synod. This then was the first judgment, most proper and most legal, of Innocent, and by it Chrysostom was not as yet declared innocent of the accusations, but restored to those rights of which he had been violently despoiled. And because Innocent reserved to another Synod the consideration of the cause *in devolutivo*, it does not follow that he thought he could not himself consider it; he had already treated it *in suspensivo*, therefore he might consider it *in petitorio* and *in devolutivo*. But the gravity of the question,

a party to which was composed of so many Eastern bishops, among whom was Theophilus, first prelate of the Orient, and already celebrated in the West for his *Paschal Letters*, translated by Jerome, and which party was aided by the Byzantine court, demanded that the Pontiff should not judge of it by himself, but together with a General Synod, over which would preside his legates, who, in his name, would give the Synodical sentence." It was better, in fine, that judgment should be delivered as was afterwards done in the case of Nestorius by the Council of Ephesus, and in that of Dioscorus by the Council of Chalcedon, but it by no means follows that Pope Innocent thought he had no right to pronounce a definitive decision.

Our position is confirmed by the letter of the emperor Honorius to his brother Arcadius, touching the cause of Chrysostom. He depicts the lamentable disorders in the Eastern churches, and shows how both parties to the present dispute had sent legates to the bishop of Rome and those of Italy, and had referred the cause to the Roman See. He then insists that, pending the decision, nothing further should have been undertaken; and yet, he says, the accused had been sent with unprecedented haste, into exile. Had the recourse of Chrysostom to Rome not had the force of an appeal, suspending the execution of the first judgment, the action of the saint's enemies would not have been so irregular as the complaint of Honorius declares it to have been. Nor can Febronius draw any comfort from the fact that the emperor says that legates were sent also to the "bishops of Italy." In settling the appeals of bishops, the Pontiffs were accustomed to examine them in a council of those prelates who formed their supreme senate, just as secular monarchs proceed in a council of ministers. But who will say that the ministers of a prince, when united in cabinet council, have the same authority as the sovereign?

After holding a Synod at Rome, Pope Innocent resolved to convoke one at Thessalonica, to be composed of both Eastern and Western bishops. Nothing more is needed to throw sufficient light upon this question than his instruction to his legates. He orders that Chrysostom "shall not

appear for judgment, until he is restored to communion and to his see, so that all occasion for refusing the sentence being removed, he may willingly come to the assembly." Innocent had therefore judged the cause of the saint, at least, *in suspensivo*, and had therefore treated his letter as an appeal. There is no question about the propriety of restoring him to his rights; that the Pontiff absolutely commands. The Thessalonican Synod was merely to inquire into the truth of the accusations brought by Theophilus against Chrysostom, and to punish those persons who had so shamefully violated the canons of the Church.

---

## CHAPTER XXIV.

### PELAGIANISM.

Whether Origen was to blame in any way, as a forerunner of this heresy, is disputed by men of erudition and acumen; that Theodore of Mopsueste (d. 428) and Rufinus (d. 410) were, we may gather from Marius Mercator (1) and from St. Jerome (2) respectively. The latter says of Rufinus, that, although dead, "he yet barks by means of a big and corpulent dog of Albion . . . . . for he has a progeny of the Scottish race (which is) in the neighborhood of Britain." Among the continentals of those days, the Britons and Scots or Irish were frequently confounded. Hence, it is not strange to hear St. Jerome calling Pelagius a Scot, "too heavy with Scotch porridge" (3). Pelagius was a British monk, but he never took Holy Orders, probably not even the minor ones, for Pope Zosimus styles him a layman (4). According to Orosius, he was fond of the pleasures of the table, bloated in the face, and heavy shouldered. But St. Augustine certainly for a time believed him to be a holy man (5), and it was only when he became better acquainted with him that he altered his

(1) *Preface to Annotations on the Writings of Julian.*

(2) *Preface to Jeremiah*, b. 5.

(3) *Idem*, b. 1.

(4) *Epist. to Aurelius.*

(5) *Remission of Sins*, b. 3, c. 1.

mind (1). Pelagius had a happy knack of making valuable acquaintances, and wherever he went, he made good use of a store of introductory letters from bishops, nobles, influential matrons, holy nuns, &c., all sounding his praises both as to learning and sanctity. His greatest successes were among noble ladies, whose love of novelty easily led them to lend their valuable aid in extending the sect. It would seem that the new heresy made its first appearance about the year 405, for in an epistle written in 417, Pelagius alludes to a letter written by himself "twelve years ago" to St. Paulinus, and St. Augustine tells us that he read that letter, and found it corrupted with Pelagianism. The principal disciple of Pelagius was a Scottish monk named Cælestius, and so active was he in the propagation of the heresy that in many places the innovators were called Cælestians; indeed, it was under that name that they were condemned at Ephesus. According to St. Augustine, Cælestius was "a man of the keenest intellect, which, had it been corrected, would have profited many." He wrote many books, which were preserved by Marius Mercator, and have been well criticized by the erudite Jesuit, John Garnier.

Before we proceed to sketch the progress of Pelagianism, it is well to note in what its errors consisted. The basis of the entire system was the erroneous assertion that Adam and Eve were created as *mortals*, so that, whether they sinned or not, they would have died. This sin of our first parents injured themselves alone, and when infants are born, they are in that state in which Adam and Eve were, before the fall. Hence infants, even if not baptized, attain to eternal life. According to Pelagius, concupiscence and death are natural conditions of humanity, even as it was created, and therefore, human nature has not been vitiated by the fall. If it has not been vitiated, it remains as in the beginning, and by its own innate strength, is able to avoid all sin. Hence, divine grace is not necessary to man, that he may perform meritorious works. From these general principles were derived an immense number of errors, permeating through the entire economy of the Christian

(1) *Deeds of Pelagius*, c. 22.

system, but which it is not our province to indicate. The morality of the Pelagians was detestable. According to them, ignorance and forgetfulness, even when vincible, excuse from sin. No rich man can enter into heaven, unless he has sold all he possessed. They exaggerated, far beyond the limits of truth and common sense, the necessity of modesty in dress, of taking no oaths, and of loving our enemies. With regard to the last, however, they inconsistently held that an enemy was never to be believed. Pelagius was very favorable to the "woman's rights" theory; hence St. Jerome upbraids him, saying (1), "Thy liberality is so great, in order that thou mayest conciliate the favor of thy Amazons, that in another place thou writest that women should have a knowledge of the Law, whereas the Apostle teaches that they should be silent in the Church, and that they should consult their husbands at home, as to what they ignore. Nor is it enough for thee to give thy women a knowledge of the Scriptures; thou must needs be rejoiced with their voices in canticles. Who does not know that females should sing in their own rooms, and not before a crowd of men?"

After having spent some time in Rome, during which they insinuated, rather than taught, their heresy, Pelagius and Cælestius crossed into Africa in the year 411, at the time of the Conference at Carthage in the affair of the Donatists. The former went, in the following year, to Jerusalem, the latter remaining for missionary work at Carthage. The bishop, Aurelius, soon excommunicated him, and he went to Ephesus, where he managed to be ordained a priest. During the next few years, St. Augustine spent much of his time in preaching against the slowly spreading heresy, and in the year 414 he received from two of the perverts of Pelagius a copy of a book which the heresiarch had written in answer to the epistle of St. Jerome to Ctesiphon, which had bitterly attacked his errors. This was the cause of St. Augustine's work on *Nature and Grace*. Pelagius had by this time made many friends in Palestine, among them, no less a personage than John, bishop of Jerusalem. This

(1) *Dialogues*. b. 1.

prelate, in order to justify Pelagius, called a Synod of his priests in the year 415. Orosius, a celebrated Spanish priest, whom St. Augustine had sent to the Holy Land to study under St. Jerome on the "origin of souls," was present, and narrated to the synodals what he had heard Pelagius say at Carthage in 412, when arraigned in a Synod in that city. This was that "man can be without sin, if he wishes," and that "the commandments of God can be easily kept." To this assertion of Orosius, Pelagius, who was, by order of the bishop, seated among the priests, took exception. "He had not said that this could be done without the help of God." The bishop said the exception was well taken, and confirmed it by Scripture. Orosius then protesting that John could not be both judge and counsel, an altercation ensued, the upshot of which was that a decision was given that a cause which had arisen among Latins, should be settled by Latins, and the affair was remitted to the Pope. Towards the end of the year, this farce was rivalled by another at Rama, then called Diospolis. A Synod was held by Eulogius of Cæsarea, to consider the complaints made against Pelagius by two Gallic prelates, Eros and Lazarus. The heresiarch had recourse to his large stock of commendatory letters, and presented one from St. Hilary of Poitiers. The records of the Synod say that the heresiarch was then asked as to his own and Cælestius' doctrine. "What does the monk Pelagius here present say to these Chapters? The Holy Synod and the Holy Church of God reprobate them. Pelagius answered, 'I again say, according to their own testimony, these are not mine; for them I owe no satisfaction. What I have avowed to be my own, I affirm to be true; what I have said are not my own, these, according to the judgment of Holy Church, I reject, saying anathema to every one contradicting the teachings of the Holy Catholic Church. For I believe in the Trinity of one substance, and in everything taught by the Holy Catholic Church. If any one avows things contrary to her doctrine, let him be anathema.' The Synod said: Now that we are satisfied as to the persecution of the monk Pelagius here present, who really consents to pious doctrine, and who rejects and anathematizes what is contrary to the

faith of the Church, we acknowledge that he is of the communion of the Church." It is to be observed that, though deceived by Pelagius, this local Synod did not approve his doctrine. Falsely, therefore, he boasted of a victory for his teachings. After this piece of fraud, the Pelagian faction waxed so turbulent and audacious, that they set fire to the monasteries under the care of St. Jerome, and killed several persons, the holy doctor narrowly escaping to a fortified tower (1). When Aurelius of Carthage learned from Orosius of the doings at Jerusalem and Diospolis, he held, in 416, a Synod of sixty-eight bishops of the Proconsulate, and condemned both Pelagius and Cælestius. The *Acts* of the Synod were sent to Pope Innocent I. "We thought it right," said the bishops, "Holy Brother, to send our *Acts* to your Charity, that the authority of the Apostolic See might be added to the statutes of our mediocrity, to guard the salvation of many, and to correct the perversity of some." In the year 416, Silvanus, primate of Numidia, held a Synod of 61 bishops at Milevi, which accused the two heresiarchs to the Pontiff, and concluded its epistle in these words: "We believe that, by the help of the mercy of our Lord and God Jesus Christ, who deigns to guide thee when consulting Him, and to hear thee when praying to Him, those who hold such perverse and pernicious things will more easily yield to thy authority, derived from the authority of the Holy Scriptures; that we may rather rejoice because of their correction, than lament their destruction." Pope Innocent I., having received the *Relations* of the African Synods, now condemned the two primary errors of Pelagianism, and defined the two opposing dogmas on the necessity of grace and on infant baptism. In a Rescript to Silvanus and the other fathers of the Milevitan Synod, he says, "Wherefore, in the authority of Apostolic vigor, we decree that Pelagius and Cælestius, that is, the inventors of new words. . . .are deprived of ecclesiastical communion, until they withdraw from the snares of the devil, in which they are held captive according to his will; that they be not received, in the meantime, into the Fold of the Lord, which they, following the perverse path, have

(1) AUGUSTINE, *Deeds of Pelagius*, last chap.

willed to desert. . . . . At the same time we command, that any who may with similar pertinacity attempt to defend the same, shall be punished, &c. Let this fixed sentence remain, therefore, against the aforesaid, &c. We order, nevertheless, that, since Christ the Lord, by His own will, has signified that He wills not the death of the dying, but that he be converted and live; if ever any shall recover, and having abandoned the error of depraved dogma, shall condemn those things for sake of which they have condemned themselves, the customary medicine, that is, her association, shall not be refused them by the Church." With the receipt of this Rescript of St. Innocent, says St. Augustine, "the cause was finished;" but well did he add, "would that the error also were ended!"

Soon after these events, Pope Innocent died, and was succeeded, on the 18th March, 417, by Zosimus. Scarcely had he been seated in the Apostolic chair, when there arrived from Palestine a letter which Pelagius had addressed to the defunct Pontiff. In it he accused of calumny the two Gallic bishops who had attacked him at Diospolis; he enclosed a Profession of Faith calculated to deceive; he enclosed also an intercessory letter from Praylius, the new bishop of Jerusalem. The new Pontiff was also approached by the heretics from another quarter. Although a superior man to the Augustinian monk, Pelagius was in many respects, physical and moral, the Luther of his heresy; Cælestius was no less its Melancthon. Far more learned than his master, and much more conciliatory, because naturally more cunning, he was the fitter man to carry on the struggle in Rome. Accordingly, he now appeared in the Eternal City, and presented a humble petition to Zosimus. In it he denied original sin, but tried to ward off the charge of heresy by saying, "If by chance any error of ignorance has crept in, let it be corrected by your judgment." He promised to condemn whatever the Holy See would condemn. Zosimus then gave him letters to the African bishops, in which he reprimanded them for giving too easy credence to the accusations of two deposed and vagrant prelates (Eros and Lazarus had been deposed in Gaul). He then

said, "Hence we have decided nothing in the present case immaturely or impulsively, . . . . . wherefore, within two months let them come to show that he (Cælestius) believes otherwise than he has pretended in his writings to us, and in his Profession of Faith, or else, after the open and manifest explanation he has made, let your Holiness know that no doubt remains." When the letter of Pelagius arrived, it produced about the same effect on the mind of Zosimus as the interview with Cælestius had done, and the result was another letter to the African bishops of the same tenor as the first. Upon the receipt of these epistles, Aurelius of Carthage immediately held a Synod of all the African bishops, which sent a letter to the Pontiff, begging him not to interfere with the judgment of his predecessors until he had examined the proofs of fraud which would soon be sent to him. Zosimus having received all the documents which the Africans sent to expose the tricks of the Pelagians, he now summoned Cælestius to a "fuller audience." But the wily disturber felt that his time had come, and fled from Rome. Thereupon, the Pontiff condemned both Pelagius and Cælestius, and their doctrines. When the news of the condemnation reached Africa, another plenary Council of the Africans was held in May, 418, in which 214 bishops received the letters of Zosimus with acclamations of joy, because, as St. Prosper said, the Pope "had armed their right hands with the sword of Peter."

Having now glanced at the origin, nature, and condemnation of Pelagianism, we must give place to some considerations which naturally arise from the facts we have narrated. And firstly, we have heard St. Augustine saying that, after the definition of St. Innocent I., "the cause was finished." The opponents of the irreformability of Papal definitions hold that the holy bishop of Hippo merely signified by this phrase that, as the Universal Church had consented to Pope Innocent's decree, nothing more was needed for a perfect knowledge of the heretical nature of Pelagianism. But that his idea was that a Pontifical decision is, by itself, conclusive of a cause, will appear from the following reflections. We have seen that after the Carthaginian synod of 416 con-

demned the teachings of Cælestius, it wrote to Pope Innocent, saying, "We send our *Acts* to your Charity, that the authority of the Apostolic See may be added to the statutes of our mediocrity, to guard the salvation of many, and to correct the perversity of some." It thought, therefore, that the authority of Rome was necessary to "guard the salvation of many;" that is, the many whom a provincial Synod's teaching would not deter from heresy, would be held back by an infallible guide. Hence, when that authority was exercised, "the cause was finished," according to Augustine, who participated in that Synod, and certainly knew its mind as well as any man in Africa. The Milevitan Synod also deemed it necessary to invoke the authority of the Pontiff, and precisely for the same end. But, it may be urged, the Milevitan fathers only desired from Innocent some Scripture testimony with which to confound the Pelagians. If the reader will again run over the words of these bishops, he will see that this interpretation is indeed strained. And again, the Milevitans already possessed the writings of Augustine and others, which were well stocked with Scripture arguments against the heretics. To these, the Pelagians would not yield; hence, the bishops invoked the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, which the Pelagians admitted to be proved by Scripture. In his letter to the Milevitans, Innocent throws light on this matter. He says that they know that "responses ever go from the Apostolic source to seekers from all the provinces . . . . especially when a question of faith is ventilated, all our fellow-bishops should have recourse only to Peter, that is, to the author of their name and honor, as your Lovingness has now done; that there may be profit to all the churches throughout the world. Wherefore we decree that Pelagius and Cælestius, the inventors of new words, be deprived, &c." St. Augustine himself in many instances plainly indicates the sense in which he said that "the cause is finished." Thus (1), "All doubt in this matter was removed by the letters of Pope Innocent of blessed memory." And he tells us that although Cælestius refused to condemn what Paulinus the Deacon declared he taught, he

(1) *To Boniface*, b. 2, c. 3.

could not resist the letters of Innocent (1). When some wished another examination, he asked, "Why do you still demand an examination, when it has been given already by the Apostolic See?" (2)

A point is raised by Bossuet which claims our attention. Peeping into every nook and corner of history in the search for instances of Papal errability, he came across the conduct of Pope Zosimus in the affair of Cælestius, and jumped to the conclusion that this Pontiff had certainly approved of a heresy, since he designated as "Catholic" the book containing heresy which Cælestius presented to him (3). Now the bishop of Meaux admits that when Zosimus interrogated Cælestius as to the letters of his predecessor, Innocent, the heresiarch answered that "he would condemn whatever the Holy See condemned." But it is certain that Zosimus stamped Cælestius as heretical in saying that infants are born without original sin; he could not, therefore, have approved his book, inasmuch as it did not acknowledge the existence of that original sin. We must conclude, therefore, that when Zosimus applied the term "Catholic" to the book presented by Cælestius, he did so, not in reference to its contents, but because of the promise to correct whatever the Pontiff should reject. "The will to correct," says Augustine, "not any falsity of dogma, was approved." But even if we were to grant that in this matter Zosimus fell into error, the school of Bossuet could derive no comfort from the concession, since the letter of the Pontiff to the Africans contained no definition *ex cathedra*, nor indeed any definition whatever. St. Augustine covers the objection of Bossuet, as though he had anticipated it, when he says, "Since this (the error upon original sin) had been placed in his book by Cælestius among those about which he said he yet doubted, and wished to be instructed upon; the will to correct, not any falsity of dogma, was approved, in a man of the keenest intellect, which would have profited many, had it been corrected. Hence his book was called Catholic, because it is the part of a Catholic mind, when it deviates from the truth, not

(1) *On Original Sin*, c. 7.

(2) *Against Julian*, b. 2, n. 102.

(3) *Defence of the Declaration*, p. 2, b. 14, c. 36.

to define the thing as certain, but to reject it, if detected and shown to be false" (1). Had Pope Zosimus declared, as Cælestius in his book affirmed, that the sin of Adam did not descend to his posterity, different, indeed, would be the aspect of affairs. But, as Augustine triumphantly asks, "What epistle of Pope Zosimus, of venerable memory, what saying can you find, in which he taught that we should believe man to be born without original sin? Never did he say such a thing, never did he write it."

We cannot close this dissertation without alluding to some of the many writers whom Pelagianism was the means of exciting to the production of some of the most valuable monuments of theological lore. First comes St. Jerome, whose learning made Prosper style him "Teacher of the World." His works on Pelagianism are the epistles to the tribune Marcellinus and to Ctesiphon; three books of *Dialogues*; the four *Prefaces* to his *Commentaries on Jeremiah*. Orosius, an intimate friend of Jerome and Augustine, having been accused of saying that "not even with the aid of God, can man be free from sin," wrote his *Apology against Pelagius, on Free Will*. But easily prince among all the Anti-Pelagians is the great St. Augustine, who, says Prosper, for twenty years and more combated the enemies of the grace of God. His first work in this material was the one dedicated to Marcellinus on *The Remission of Sins*, composed in the year 412. In the same year, he wrote his *Grace of the New Testament* to please his friend Honoratus, to whom he, in great measure, owed his conversion from Manicheism. This year also came forth the book on *The Spirit and the Letter*. In 413, Augustine preached his principal Sermon against the Pelagians in the chief basilica of Carthage. It is the fourteenth of the sermons on the *Words of the Apostles*. In 414, he produced a book on the *Perfection of Justice*, in which he teaches that man can avoid sin, when helped by the grace of God, and answers the objections of Cælestius taken from Scripture. In 415, was published the work on *Nature and Grace*, in answer to a book in which Pelagius defended the nature of man against God's grace. In 417, Augustine brought out a history of the

(1) To Boniface, b. 2, c. 3.

*Deeds of Pelagius*, and his epistle on the *Presence of God*. In 418, were issued the epistle to Optatus on the *Origin of the Soul*, and the first book on *Nuptials and Concupiscence*. Besides these, he produced a large number of epistles in defence and explanation of the Catholic doctrine on grace.

We must not omit to notice that large body of men who, like the Semiarians in reference to the Arians, without involving themselves in the condemnation of Pelagius, yet were sufficiently tainted with the poison to be called Semipelagians. They were thoroughly orthodox in their doctrine as to original sin and the necessity of the grace of Christ for its remission. Their fundamental error lay in denying the necessity of divine grace for the beginning of faith, or for those first movements of the will which prompt the striving for eternal salvation. Their leader was John Cassian, a monk of uncertain nationality, but who became quite celebrated for sanctity and erudition, and whose ascetic maxims are prized to this day. He was sent by St. Chrysostom to Pope St. Innocent I., when that saint found it necessary to appeal to Rome, and when he learned that his holy patron had died under his torments, he went to Marseilles, and there founded a monastery. He wrote many works, and Semipelagianism is visible in nearly all. Nevertheless, he died with a reputation for sanctity, and St. Gregory the Great congratulates a certain abbess in Marseilles upon the fact that her monastery is dedicated to St. Cassian (1). The doctrines of Cassian were embraced by most of the monks of Lerins, and the writings of their abbot Faust were directed especially against St. Augustine. That Vincent of Lerins and Hilary of Arles were Semipelagians, seems more than probable (2). Christian writers at this time, and for about a century, were in matters of grace, either Pelagian, Semipelagian, or Augustinian. But in the beginning of the sixth century, Semipelagianism was no longer tenable by a Catholic. Pope Gelasius condemned the books of Cassian, and Pope Hormisdas those of Faust, and in the year 529, the Synods of Valence and Orange condemned the Semipelagian doctrines, receiving in the following year the confirmation of Pope Boniface II.

(1) Book 6, *epist.* 12, to the Abbess *Respecta*.

(2) ALEXANDRE: *5th Cent.*, c. 3, art. 7, § 6 and 7.

## CHAPTER XXV.

### CONTROVERSY ON AFRICAN APPEALS TO ROME.

During the Pontificate of Pope Zosimus, there came to Rome an African priest named Apiarius, who had been excommunicated by his ordinary, Urban, bishop of Sicca. Appealing to the Pontiff, although the bishops of Africa at that time contended that African custom did not allow a simple priest to do so, he found that his appeal was not rejected. However, with the proverbial prudence of the Roman See, Pope Zosimus acted in such a manner as not to unnecessarily irritate the susceptibilities of the African prelates, while, at the same time, he did not forget the inalienable prerogatives of the Holy See, or the rights of her humblest child. He thought it best to proceed in accordance with a decree which, in the year 418, had been issued by a Carthaginian synod, and which allowed the "inferior clergy," who might feel themselves unjustly treated by their own ordinaries, to be judged by a Synod of the provincial bishops. He therefore sent to Africa three legates, Faustin, bishop of Potenza, and Philip and Asellus, priests of Holy Roman Church, who were instructed to investigate the case of Apiarius in a Synod composed of the bishops of his province. This legation ought not to have nettled the African prelates, but lest it might, the Pontiff instructed his legates to call their attention to certain ecclesiastical canons which recognized the right of Rome to receive appeals. The cited canons were those of Sardica, of which we have spoken in chapter 19, but, unluckily, as it proved, for the expediting of the affair in hand, Zosimus spoke of them as canons of the Council of Nice. In doing this, he only followed the custom of the Roman Church, which preserved the canons of Sardica in the same codex and under the same title as those of Nice (1). When the legates

(1) When treating of the Council of Sardica, we remarked that it was generally regarded as a kind of appendix to that of Nice. Many of the Popes cited the canons of Sardica

arrived in Africa, Aurelius of Carthage convoked a Synod, and quite a dispute arose as to the canons cited by Zosimus. They were not found in the African codices of Nice, and as for the Council of Sardica, the bishops seem to have had no remembrance of any such assemblage, save the infamous *concilubulum* of Philippopolis, to which the schismatics had fastened the date of Sardica (2). Such a difference could scarcely be expected to vanish immediately, hence it was resolved to call a plenary Council; but, so great was the respect of the Synod for the Pontifical wishes, it was resolved that, in the meantime, the canons quoted by Zosimus should be obeyed. On May 28 of the year 419, the case of Apiarius, and the accompanying question of appeals, were considered by 217 bishops in the presence of the Papal legates. We learn from the Synodical Epistle, addressed to Pope Boniface I., the successor of Zosimus, that it was decided to restore Apiarius to communion, but, as a measure of prudence, he was given "letters dimissory," and he settled down in the diocese of Tabraca. As for the canons cited by Pope Zosimus, the Synod repeated what had been already reported to Rome, namely, that those canons were not to be found in the Nicene codices in use among the Africans. The fathers therefore suggested that Pope Boniface should inquire as to their genuineness, in Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, where the most authentic codices of Nice

as those of Nice. Thus, Innocent I., while quoting them to the Constantinopolitans, says that "only the canons of Nice" are to be observed. Even St. Leo the Great spoke in a similar manner. Mark Anthony de Dominis, the apostate archbishop of Spalato (d. 1624), accuses Pope Zosimus of deliberate forgery and imposture in this matter. When Hosius of Cordova, the papal legate, returned from the Council of Sardica, he brought its canons with him, just as he had brought those of Nice from that Synod. Both were preserved in the Roman archives under the one title of Nicene. And not only at Rome were the two collections united. To this day Gallic codices are extant, in which the two are quoted together. In the time of Justinian, some, at least, of the Eastern codices must have presented the same union; for, in his edict on the Orthodox Faith, that emperor, after distinctly styling the Council of Sardica oecumenical, numbers down to his time only four General Councils, thus showing that he regarded those of Nice and Sardica as one. The reason why the Synod of Sardica was looked upon as an appendix to that of Nice, was its having been called to establish what the latter had constituted, and not for the definition of any new dogma. Hosius was Papal legate to both Councils, and many of the Nicene fathers sat in the Council of Sardica; hence, just as the General Council under Eugenius IV. is called Florentine, although its first sessions were held at Ferrara, so these two Synods of Nice and Sardica, held by almost the same prelates and for the same object, were spoken of as one. St. Gregory of Tours (*History of the Franks*, b. 9) cites as canons of Nice, the canons of the Gangrensan provincial Synod, because it was held about that time, and under Hosius. Thus also, the Greeks commonly attribute the Trullan canons to the Sixth Council, because they regarded the Trullan Synod as an appendix to that Council.

(2) As for the ignorance of the Africans in regard to the true Council of Sardica, see St. Augustine's *epistle* 44 (or 163), which was written in the year 398, that is, twenty years before the Papal legates cited the "Nicene canons" to the prelates assembled in Carthage.

were likely to be found. Until answers should be received, however, the prelates of Africa, they promised, would observe the instructions of Pope Zosimus. The search among the Oriental exemplars of the Nicene records having been made, and no canons having been found such as Zosimus had quoted, the African bishops mentioned the fact to Pope Boniface ; but, in the meantime, they did not prevent appeals to Rome, as is seen in the case of Lawrence of Icosium which is mentioned by St. Augustine, in an epistle to Pope Cælestine. Things remained in *statu quo* until towards the end of the year 425, when the unfortunate Apiarius gave occasion for a renewal of the complaints against "transmarine" appeals. This miserable man had not profited by experience, and he so conducted himself in the diocese of Tabraca that he was again excommunicated. Again he had recourse to Rome, and he so well managed his case that Pope Cælestine, who then occupied the chair of Peter, sent him back to Africa, accompanied by the legate Faustin of Potenza, who was instructed to see that justice was done the apparently persecuted priest. When Faustin appeared in Carthage, he acted more like a patron than a judge towards Apiarius, and the bishops of Africa became more than ever averse to the idea of appeals from their decisions. But so far as Apiarius was concerned, the question was soon ended, for when Aurelius of Carthage had opened the new plenary Council summoned for a reconsideration of the case, the culprit unexpectedly avowed his crimes, and then, so far as history shows, disappeared from the scene. While yet influenced by the remembrance of the horrors of which Apiarius had confessed himself guilty, the Synod of Carthage addressed a letter to Pope Cælestine, in which they energetically complained of the inconveniences and even disorders entailed by "transmarine" appeals. We have now to look into the nature and meaning of this letter, that we may see whether the opponents of Papal authority can derive any comfort therefrom. But before we treat of the letter itself, we must examine another document which will throw light upon it, namely, the canon on appeals which, in the year 419, was issued by the 2nd Synod of Carthage

which bishop Aurelius assembled for the consideration of this matter.

This canon had originally been edited in the Synod of 418, and it was in recognition of it that Pope Zosimus instructed his legates to consider the case of Apiarius in a provincial Synod. It reads as follows: "It was pleasing, that if priests, deacons, or other inferior clerics, complain of the decisions of their bishops in any case, they shall be heard by the neighboring bishops, with the consent of the ordinary, and the prelates assigned by him shall settle the case. But if they wish to appeal from this judgment, let them not have recourse to transmarine tribunals, but to the Primates of their provinces, or to a plenary Council, as has frequently been ordered in regard to bishops. And let no one within the province accord communion to him who appeals to a transmarine tribunal." The phrase of this canon, "as has frequently been ordered in regard to bishops," has been rejected as not authentic by Orsi and Alexandre (1). The brothers Ballerini and Zaccaria are willing to regard it as a part of the original canon, but it proves nothing against the right of Rome to receive episcopal appeals. Where are the decrees by which such appeals were "frequently" prohibited? Not one can be adduced. Again, we have a letter written by Pope Boniface to his legates, then in Africa, under date of the 26 April, 419 (2), from which we learn that they had informed the Pontiff that all trouble had vanished. Now it is very improbable that within two months the African bishops would have again become so troublesome as to prohibit episcopal appeals. Had the legates not possessed good reason for believing in their acquiescence, they would not have represented the state of affairs as calm and satisfactory. Finally, it is not at all likely that a Synod which promised, at least, a temporary obedience to the canons cited by Zosimus, would, at the same time, and in the presence of the Papal legates, deny a

(1) Alexander gives the following reasons for rejecting the phrase: It is not to be found in the Milevitan canon, nor in the Collection of Cresconius. Again, no African Conciliary canon can be produced, which prohibits appeals of bishops to Rome. Also, the African bishops, when they wrote to Pope Celestine, offered every argument they could exhortate against appeals, but said nothing of any such canon. See *4th Cent., diss. 28, prop. 3*.

(2) MANSI; *Councils*, vol. IV., col. 431. AMORT; *Canon Law*, vol. I.

right which those canons conceded. What interpretation then is to be given to the canon in question? A reading, by no means forced, and the only one which would not be contradicted by the history of the time, is presented by the *Ballerinis*, *Zaccaria*, and *Palma*, which so recommends itself, that it is strange that any other should have ever occurred to any mind. The adversaries of the Papal authority understand the canon as saying "let them not have recourse to transmarine tribunals, as has been ordered in regard to bishops;" but the phrase "as has been ordered, &c." should be applied, in the most natural manner, to the immediately preceding one, "but to the Primates of their provinces, or to a plenary council." The sense of the canon would therefore be, that priests should not appeal to the Pontiff, unless they had previously had recourse to the Primate or to a Council, in the third instance, as had been arranged already in the case of appealing bishops. It must be observed that hitherto, in conformity with the Synod of Hippo of 393, African priests were allowed to appeal from the decision of their own ordinary to that of six neighboring bishops, as a tribunal of the second instance. But as the priests often appealed to Rome, in the third instance, the African prelates decided that for the inferior clergy, as well as for the superior, there should be a tribunal of the third instance in their own land, namely, that of the Primate or of a national Synod. Unless this is the correct reading of the Carthaginian canon, it is impossible to account for the appeals to Rome which we know to have been made, before its promulgation, by African bishops. When treating of the Donatists, we had occasion to quote the 162d epistle of St. Augustine, in which, speaking of Cæcilian of Carthage, whom the Donatists had excommunicated, he says, "He might well ignore the multitude of his conspiring enemies, when he saw that he was joined in communion with the Roman Church, in which always flourished the principality of the Apostolic chair, and with the other places whence the gospel came into Africa, where he was ready to plead his cause . . . . For it was not a question of priests, deacons, or of clergy of the lower order, but of colleagues, who could re-

serve their causes entire, for the judgment of the other colleagues, especially of the Apostolic Churches. . . . he saw remaining to himself an incorruptible examination of his cause by a transmarine church, free of private enmities and independent of each party to the dispute." St. Augustine certainly was well informed as to the customs of the African churches. We have also the instance of Perreivius, threatened with deposition by his co-provincials, who appealed to Pope Boniface I. In his letter to his vicar, Rufus, whom he appointed to investigate the case, the Pontiff says, "We wish your Charity to carefully hear the case, calling together the aforesaid bishops, from whose persecution he (Perreivius) says he suffers. Then let them know that if anything has been done contrary to custom, it must be cancelled; and having examined the affair, let your Charity hasten to refer it all to us, that the judgment given by you may be confirmed by our sentence." The appeal of Anthony, bishop of Fussala, made to the same Pope Boniface (1), is also well authenticated.

We now return to the letter which the 3rd Synod of Carthage sent to Pope Cælestine after the confession of Apiarius. Febronius (2) says, "This new form of ecclesiastical judgment did not altogether please the Africans, and in their Synod of Carthage, held about the year 425, they wrote to Pope Cælestine, asking him not only not to receive the wicked appeals of priests and other clerics (which at that time were not rare), but even not to send any legates to investigate the cases of appealing bishops." Nevertheless, the African bishops did not contest the Pontifical *right* to receive appeals. They knew that the use of such appeals had been always known in Africa. In the letter sent by him to Pope Cælestine, with reference to Anthony of Fussala, St. Augustine says: "There are instances of some, who, on account of their crimes, through the judgment or confirmation of the Apostolic See, have not been deprived of the episcopal honor, nor yet have been entirely unpunished. Not to go in search of the remote ones, I shall only mention the more recent examples." If the African bishops, with a

(1) LUTPS; *Appeals*, dissert. II., c. 21.

(2) *Chap.* 5, § 5.

knowledge of this antiquity of the right of appeal, had thought to annul it, why simply beg the Pontiff to render a less facile countenance to every appellant? Why did they not protest against it as a usurpation? But they utter no word which can be construed as a denial of the Papal prerogative. They speak of the distance from the Eternal City, and hence the ease of deception; of many other inconveniences, too manifest in the case of Apiarius, and hence combat the *expediency* of appeals. If the Africans denied the *right* of appeal, why, when bitterly complaining of the patronizing attitude of Faustin towards Apiarius, did they not stamp his action as a usurpation? Let us hear their letter: "We entreat that hereafter you will not so readily admit to audience those who go from here to you, nor receive into communion those whom we have excommunicated . . . you should guard against too hastily restoring to communion those who have been rejected in their own province . . . do not be willing, at the instance of every petitioner, to send your clerics as executors of your sentences" (1). Though these words betray a very strong sentiment against the expediency of entertaining appeals, they certainly acknowledge the Pontifical right to receive them.

The African church was certainly most hostile to appeals to Rome, and prohibited them to the inferior clergy, in the 2nd and 5th Carthaginian and in the Milevitan Synods. But it could not deny a *right*, which necessarily belongs to him who was commanded to feed the sheep of the Lord, and to confirm his brethren. After these canons were passed, the inferior clerics continued to appeal to the Pontiff, and were not repulsed. Thus, St. Gregory the Great (2) speaks of the recourse of the deacons Vincent and Felicissimus at one time, and of the deacons Constantius and Mustellus at another. The examples of appeals on the part of the inferior clergy of other regions are, however, much more frequent. The clerics of Constantinople, who were degraded by Nestorius, appealed to Pope Cælestine, and were restored. The same happened with Ætius the archdeacon, and the

(1) *Epist. Rom. Pont.*, vol. 1.

(2) *Book I., epist. 82; Book II., epist. 33.*

monk Eutyches, appealing to St. Leo. To this Pontiff also appealed many Alexandrian clerics, from the persecutions of Dioscorus. From Gaul also there came appeals to St. Leo. The priests Savinian and Leo had recourse to his tribunal after their degradation by Rusticus of Narbonne. Tuentius besought the protection of Pope Zosimus against the vexations of Proculus of Marseilles. The clerics of Arles appealed to Pelagius I. against Sapandus. In fine, the epistles of Zosimus, St. Leo, Pelagius I., and St. Gregory I., show that the inferior clergy frequently had recourse for justice to the Holy See, sometimes even in the first instance (1). We would here notice a remark of the famous Abp. De Marca, to the effect that Pope Zosimus claimed the right of receiving episcopal appeals, only because the emperors Arcadius and Honorius had resigned the right of issuing imperial rescripts for the revision of such cases. Let the reader note the following words of the Pontiff to the fathers of Carthage, and he will find that the right was claimed as derived from the canons, from tradition, and from Christ: "Although the tradition of the fathers has given such authority to the Apostolic See, that no one can dare to differ from its decision, and has preserved that authority by the canons and laws, and the current discipline shows by its rules the reverence it feels for the name of Peter, from which it itself comes down; for canonical antiquity, by unanimous consent, has held the power of this apostle to be so great, from the promise of Christ our God, that he can bind what is loosed and loose what is bound, the same power being given to him who holds the authority of the See . . . . . Since, therefore, Peter is possessed of such authority, and the studies of our forefathers have established that by both human and divine law is strengthened the Roman Church, which, in the place of Peter, we rule with the power of his name, as you know, dear brethren, and as priests ought to know; when we possess such authority, that no one can reject our decisions, . . . . . we wish to consider the case of him who has been accused among you, as your own letters say, and who, declaring himself innocent, has appealed to our See."

(1) RONCAGLIA; *parag. I., in note to Alexandre's Diss. 28, 4th Cent.*

We have hitherto allowed it to be taken for granted that the Council of Carthage prohibited, in some way or another, or unless made under some certain conditions, appeals to the Roman See. But the canon adduced by our adversaries by no means compels us to this admission. When the African prelates forbade recourse to transmarine tribunals, it is not certain that they intended to include appeals to Rome in the prohibition; indeed, the contrary is more than insinuated in the same canon as cited by Gratian, *causa II., quest. VI.*, for, immediately after the excommunicatory clause, we there read the exception: "Unless he appealed to the Roman See." That is, Gratian expressly mentions that exception which, in all canons of this nature, Innocent I. declares to be understood. This Pontiff, alluding to the canons of Sardica (which he calls Nicene), says "It is permitted to no one—without prejudice, however, of the Roman Church, which must be revered, in all causes—to leave the clergy who, by the Providence of God, govern the Church in the same province, and to recur to other provinces" (1). Unless this general rule of excepting the Roman See, in all such prohibitory canons, had been kept in mind by the African bishops, the legate Faustin would certainly have asserted the privileges of that See, as we know he was accustomed to do. The authors of this canon would scarcely have applied the common and indefinite adjective *transmarine* to that Church which they recognized as the mother of all. Nor did they complain of any violation of their canon, when Apiarius appealed to Rome the second time, and Faustin was sent to his assistance. That they would have complained, had their intentions been disregarded or contemned, is to be supposed, when we consider the bitterness which, throughout the controversy, they otherwise manifested. Even when the confession of his crimes, on the part of Apiarius, had demonstrated how justly they had condemned him, they did not dare ask the Pontiff not to receive any more appeals. They merely besought that such appeals should not be *very easily* entertained: "We earnestly entreat that you will not very easily listen to those who go hence; and that you will not

(1) *Epistle to Victoricius.*

accord communion to those who have been excommunicated by us." Aurelius of Carthage had a chief part in the formation and promulgation of the canon under consideration, and certainly he must be regarded as an excellent interpreter of its significance. Well, in his Synodical Letter, written to Pope Cælestine a few years later, he plainly acknowledges the right of the Pontiff to revise the causes of priests already judged in Africa.

It has been urged that, from its very infancy, the African church enjoyed the privilege of giving definitive judgment in the causes of her priests and deacons; that this privilege was not abolished before the time of St. Gregory the Great, into whose hands the Africans renounced it. Naturally then, it is objected, we must suppose that, in the formation of the Carthaginian canon, the African prelates designed to include the Roman See among the "transmarine" to whom appeal was to be illicit. That the African churches enjoyed the privilege alleged, is well proven by many testimonies, but, before a conclusion can be reached in the matter in question, we should understand the precise nature of the privilege. The Roman Pontiff, in his capacity of Patriarch of the West, had the power to relax the immediate dependence of the Western churches upon his patriarchal see; to remit, as occasion demanded, the right of receiving appeals which all the patriarchs possessed in regard to their subject provinces. But the Roman See must be considered from a point of view different from that from which we regard Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; at Rome there is another chair besides the patriarchal throne, viz., the chair of the Supreme Pontiff of the Universal Church. To abrogate the essential rights of this chair of Peter, is not within the power, even of Peter's successor (1).

Before closing this chapter, we would draw the reader's attention to the valuable essay of Mark Anthony Cappello, which is one of the best ever written upon this subject.

(1) Our adversaries admit that this African custom was a privilege. A privilege does not destroy the right of him who accords it, but rather, by its very exercise, demonstrates the superiority of the giver. As Cappello well observes, this African privilege may be compared to the honor accorded by the Roman emperors to the Prefects of the Pretorium, "from whose decisions no one could ever appeal;" which honor, however, did not render the Prefect independent of the imperial authority.

This Franciscan controversialist, incited by the carpings of the apostate De Dominis, who had exchanged his archiepiscopal see of Spalato for the Anglican deanery of Windsor, and had issued a most bitter diatribe on the Holy See (1), published, in 1622, a "Dissertation on the Appeals of the African Church to the Roman See." In this, the first edition of his work, Cappello rejected as spurious the epistles of Pope Zosimus to the African bishops, in which the Pontiff is disposed to be lenient towards Pelagius and Cælestius, on account of their simulated docility. He also denied the authenticity of the Synodal Letters of the 6th Carthaginian Synod to Popes Boniface and Cælestine, and threw doubt over the entire history of Apiarius. Nor was Cappello entirely alone in this view of the subject. The illustrious cardinal Du Perron, who wrote about the same time (2), thought that the true meaning of the letters to Boniface and Cælestine could not be reached, unless through the Greek version; that the Collection of Canons, attributed to the Carthaginian Synod, was the rhapsody of some private individual. Even the erudite and critical Christian Lupus said of Cappello's opinion, that though he "would not dare follow it, yet it is not without foundation, nor are the arguments of the learned author frivolous" (3). But the theory of Cappello was soon found to be untenable, owing to the authority of the Hermian Facundus, first published, in 1629, by Sirmond; and by that of the *Commonitory* of Mercator, edited first by Labbe, in 1671. Cappello himself, in the last years of his life, met the Vatican apograph, which Sirmond afterwards gave to the light, and was led to reconsider his views. Accordingly, after much investigation, especially in the works of St. Augustine, Cappello prepared a new edition of his work, in which he accepted as genuine both the canons of Carthage and the epistles of Zosimus and the African fathers. The volume, however, did not see the light until the year 1722, when it was published by order of Pope Clement XI., into whose hands, when a youth, the MSS. had been given. Modern critics have ap-

(1) *The Ecclesiastical Republic.*

(2) *Reply to the Response of the King of Great Britain.*

(3) *Roman Appeals*, diss. 2, c. 30.

proved of many of Cappello's judgments in matters of their special province. In Chap. II. of the dissertation now before us, he proves, against the author of the common Collection of Canons, and against Baronio, that the canon on African appeals was not a canon of Milevi, but of Carthage; and this opinion has been followed by Noris, Pagi, and Tillemont. "The proceedings," he says (1), "of the ancient Council of Africa have come down to us enshrouded in such darkness, that they cannot be restored to their native integrity without immense labor; and unless they are restored it is impossible to form a correct judgment as to the things done in that church. Take, as an example, the canon on appeals to 'transmarine' sees, which had for its author, one or another Council, as I shall show; but which has been attributed to four, *i. e.*, to two of Milevi and to two of Carthage. If it was enacted in either one of the Milevitan Synods, then the Roman Pontiff was either unwilling, or ignorant of its issue. But if it was passed in either one of the Carthaginian Councils, not so; for whatever was done therein, was done with the approval, and by order of, the Roman Pontiff. Since, therefore, the very essence of this difficulty depends upon a knowledge of the authorship of the canon, we must investigate the matter as diligently and as accurately as possible." Cappello then proves that the canon on "transmarine" appeals was not edited by either of the Synods of Milevi which were held during the reign of Pope Innocent I. (there were only two); not by the first, for no such canon is found ascribed to it in the Codex of African Canons; not by the second, because that Synod was merely provincial, and only a national and plenary Council could issue a decree like the "transmarine" canon, which affected the whole African church. It was issued, therefore, by a Council of Carthage, and as we know it first saw the light in the 12th Consulate of Honorius and the 8th of Theodosius, it follows that it was enacted by the plenary Council held in 418, and repeated in the following year in the sixth, also plenary, Synod. But since both these Synods were held under the auspices and express approbation of Rome, it follows that none of their canons could have

(1) *Appeals of the African Church*, c. II., n. I.

been intended to curtail the Roman authority. Therefore the famous "transmarine" canon was directed, not against appeals to the mother See, but against recourse to the arbitration of other "transmarine" churches, *e. g.*, of Milan, or of Arles, to which sees African disputes were frequently referred (1).

---

## CHAPTER XXVI.

### NESTORIANISM, AND THE COUNCIL OF EPHEBUS.

Nestorius, by birth a Syrian, at first a monk, and then a priest of the church of Antioch, was appointed by Theodosius to the see of Constantinople in the year 427. He had scarcely received the episcopal consecration, when his true character commenced to reveal itself. Animated, says Socrates, by a tempestuous audacity, and by an ardent desire of fame, rather than by a true zeal for the faith, he made this eruption in his oration to the emperor: "Give me the earth, O emperor, purged of heretics, and I will give heaven to thee. Aid me in the destruction of heretics, and I will aid thee in destroying the Persians." He commenced at once a most bitter war against almost every kind of error, as though, says Vincent of Lerins, he wished to prepare an open way for his own. With his own hands he once applied the torch to an Arian temple, and as a devastating fire ensued which for a while threatened the entire capital, the indignant populace began to style him a "fire-bug." We have said that he was bitter against *almost* every error, for he rather favored Pelagianism, as we gather from a letter of Pope Cælestine written in response to one of Nestorius interceding for the Pelagians of Constantinople.

(1) History furnishes several instances of arbitration in African causes by the churches of Milan and Arles. The reason for this action is as follows: In the Council of Sardica, at which Gratus of Carthage and thirty-five other African prelates were present, it was enacted, *Can. XIV.*, that a condemned cleric "had the right of appeal to the bishop of the metropolis of the same province; and if there were no metropolitan, he could recur to a neighboring metropolitan, and request him to examine into the affair." Now in the African provinces there were no regular metropolitans, their office being filled by the senior bishops, no matter of what sees they were the prelates. Hence grew the custom of recurring to the metropolitan of Milan or of Arles.

But his own pet crop showed itself in the very first year of his episcopate. His primary errors were two. First, he contended that the Man formed in the womb of Mary was other than the Word of God; that the Incarnation was simply a dwelling of the Word in man as in a temple, so that God was not born, and did not suffer and die; that Christ therefore was not God, but only the Temple of God. His second error was in styling the Blessed Virgin, not *Theotokos*, "Mother of God," but *Christotokos*, "Mother of Christ." His earliest lieutenants were a bishop named Dorotheus and a priest called Anastasius, who opened the campaign by anathematizing all who designated Mary as Mother of God, Nestorius being at the time of the outburst seated on his episcopal throne. The congregation were horrified at the blasphemy, and a certain simple monk openly contradicted it, and attempted to put Anastasius out of the sacred building. But by order of Nestorius the zealous man was publicly flogged, and sent into exile (1). The greater part of the people now began to absent themselves from church, lest they should communicate with heretics. Many priests attempted in their sermons to check the spread of the contagion, but the threats of their bishop kept too many silent. In the meantime, the false shepherd was indefatigable in his preaching, and soon the faithful lamented that "an emperor we have, but no bishop" (2). Like many heresiarchs, Nestorius found a valuable ally in his nefarious work in his external appearance. The mortification of abstinence seemed to shine forth from his pallid features and his delicate frame; grave thoughts had impressed a solemn seal upon his intellectual brow; a certain modest sadness, which is not without a charm, especially for the fair, pervaded his gestures. His clothes bore the marks of long usage; he certainly loved books, and he claimed to love solitude. With these advantages, and an eloquence greatly admired, his forte lay in preaching. But there were not wanting in the capital able defenders of the truth. A distinguished attorney named Eusebius (afterwards bishop of Dorylæum)

(1) See the *Supplication to the Emperor* of the monks of Constantinople, extant in the *Acts of the Council of Ephesus*, p. 1, c. 30.

(2) *Ibi*.

challenged the prelate to a public dispute, and Proclus, newly consecrated as bishop of Cyzicus, delivered an admirable panegyric on the Mother of God before an immense audience of all classes of society. To this latter Nestorius responded immediately by an extemporaneous oration, and afterwards in three set sermons. Before long he published his treatise on the *Incarnation*, and several *Homilies*, which he took care to send as feelers into Egypt. It was owing to this importation among his people that St. Cyril of Alexandria wrote his *Epistle to Monks*, which work so excited the angry fears of the heretic that he laid before Theodosius an accusation of treason against the saint (1). The two prelates now interchanged letters; Cyril breathing the spirit of charity towards his adversary and that of chivalrous devotion towards Mary, and Nestorius lamenting the "intemperance and injustice" of the Alexandrian prelate. A further correspondence soon ensued, in which Nestorius plainly betrayed his arrogance and vanity, while he in the clearest terms announced his heresy. While these letters were passing between Constantinople and Alexandria, Nestorius wrote twice to Pope Cælestine. St. Cyril also addressed the Pontiff concerning the new doctrine, because, he says, "the ancient custom of the churches requires that such things be communicated to your Holiness." He then proceeds as follows: "We would not openly break our communion with him, before we had informed you of these things. Deign, therefore, to tell us what you think, that it may be clear to us whether we ought to communicate with him, or rather freely announce to him that no one can communicate with him who favors and teaches this erroneous doctrine. Further, the mind of your Integrity upon this matter ought to be made clearly known by letter to the devout bishops of Macedonia, and to all the bishops of the East. . . . that with one soul we may all persist in one doctrine, and give help to the true faith which is now attacked." Among other writings which St. Cyril produced about this period was a letter to Acacius of Beroe, to which he received a reply full of praise for his zeal, but full, also,

(1) CYRIL; *Apology to Theodosius*.

of excuses for Nestorius, as for one guilty only of a slip of the tongue.

When Pope Cælestine had read the letters of Cyril and of Nestorius, he held a Synod of such bishops as were then in the Eternal City, in August, 430. Sentence of excommunication and deposition was pronounced against Nestorius unless within ten days from notification he renounced his errors, *in an open and written confession*. All whom Nestorius had wickedly deprived of communion were restored to it; the Pelagians, whom he had restored, were recondemned. Seven epistles were sent by the Pontiff. One was to Cyril of Alexandria, that he would represent the Holy See in the cause of Nestorius, and in providing for the see of Constantinople. Another was to Nestorius, urging him to return to his right mind. A third was directed to the Constantinopolitan clergy, encouraging them to persevere in the faith. The others were to John of Antioch, Rufus of Thessalonica, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and Flavian of Philippi, begging them, as bishops of the next greatest sees of the Orient, to labor energetically in the cause of truth. In the month of November, St. Cyril proceeded to carry out the orders of the Holy See. All the bishops of Egypt were assembled in a Synod at Alexandria, and a Synodical Epistle sent to Nestorius by the hands of four legates. In this letter, the heresiarch is officially informed of the sentence pronounced by the Pope against him; he is notified that the Synod communicates with all those whom he has excommunicated for their fidelity; he is ordered to publicly, and in writing, reject his heresies; he is furnished with a Profession of Faith, and with twelve *Anathematisms*, written by Cyril, to which he is required to subscribe. But Nestorius was far, indeed, on the road to perdition. Instead of obeying, he at once issued twelve counter *Anathematisms*, each one a blasphemous contradiction to a corresponding one of Cyril. He declared the Alexandrian *Anathematisms* infested with Apollinarianism. He at once, after the usual style of heresiarchs, proceeded to secure the help of the government, filling the ears of Theodosius with calumnies as to Cyril's fidelity to Pul-

cheria (1), and alleging that when Cyril had dedicated his book on *The Right Faith* to the emperor, he dedicated a similar one to his imperial sister, for the purpose of securing her aid against Theodosius, should he prove averse to him. In the meantime, letters were sent to the greater sees throughout the world, giving notice of an Œcumenical Council, to be held at Ephesus on the Pentecost day of the year 431. When the eventful day arrived, there came to Ephesus, on the part of the emperor, a certain courtier, Count Candidian by name, with orders to expel from the city all the monks and foreign seculars, lest they should interfere with the liberty of the bishops. He was instructed also to allow no bishop to leave before the end of the Synod, but was prohibited from intruding in any way upon the proper business of the Council. Nestorius arrived, accompanied by twelve of his episcopal partisans. Marius Mercator puts the number of attending bishops at 274, but the best authorities fix it at 218. In the beginning of the Council, Cyril of Alexandria presided in the name of Pope Cælestine; the other legates, the bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and the priest Philip, being delayed on their journey until the second *Action*, on the 10th of July.

Although fixed for the day of Pentecost, the fathers waited sixteen days for the coming of John of Antioch, but finally they opened their sessions in St. Mary's church on the 22nd of June. In the first *Action*, were read the Nicene Creed, the 2d epistle of Cyril to Nestorius, the epistle of Pope Cælestine to the same, and the Synodical Letter of Alexandria. Also was read, and declared heretical, the epistle of Nestorius to Cyril commencing, "The contumelies of your wonderful letters, &c." The testimony of the legates whom Cyril had sent to Nestorius was then taken, to the effect that he had not complied with the demands of the Pope. Theodotus of Ancyra, and Acacius of Melitus, also swore to having heard blasphemies from the mouth of Nestorius. Many extracts from various writings of the heresiarch

(1) During the minority of Theodosius II., the empire was governed by his elder sister, Pulcheria, a woman of heroic virtue, and now honored by the Church as a saint. Throughout his reign, she had great influence over him for his own and the people's good, but he often chafed under what his eunuchs, whom he too often consulted, termed a yoke.

were also presented to the Council, all manifestly heretical. Then the Synod pronounced the sentence of excommunication and deposition against Nestorius, "compelled by the sacred canons, and by the Epistle of the Most Holy Father and Co-minister, Cælestine, Bishop of the Roman Church." This sentence was inscribed "To Nestorius, the New Judas," and was sent to him. Theodosius, deceived by Count Candidian, who intercepted the *Synodical Relation to the Emperor*, now sent a rescript to the Council, declaring the proceedings defective (1), but the Council seems to have paid it no attention. In the second *Action*, the legates Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip, having arrived, the letter of Pope Cælestine to the Synod was read, the fathers acclaiming Cælestine as "the new Paul," the "Guardian of the Faith," &c. The legates then demanded that they should be informed of what had been already done, but this was postponed until the next session. In the third *Action*, the proceedings already held in the cause of Nestorius were read, and approved of by the Papal legates. A *Relation* was then sent to the emperor, informing him that the Pontifical legates had confirmed the deposition of the heresiarch, and requesting permission for the Synodals to leave Ephesus. In the fourth *Action*, as St. Cyril and Memnon presented a complaint against John of Antioch and his conciliabulars, for their pretended deposition of the complainants, the Council sent three bishops to John's residence to cite him before it. The summoners returned, reporting that they had been disrespectfully repelled by the guards, whereupon the fathers decreed John's action against Cyril and Memnon null and void. In the fifth *Action*, Cyril demanded that the bishop of Antioch should be forced to prove all his charges against the Alexandrian prelate, or be punished for calumny. Then John was again thrice cited to appear, and as he persisted in his obstinacy, sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him and his followers (2). In the sixth *Action*, the fathers

(1) John of Antioch had already, immediately upon his arrival at Ephesus, before proceeding to the Council, surrounded himself with 43 bishops at his residence, and caused them to sign a decree of deposition against St. Cyril and against Memnon of Ephesus, as guilty, the first of Apollinarism, the second of usurpation. He also threatened the other fathers with excommunication, unless, by a certain day, they joined his "Synod." He then sent a *Relation* of his proceedings to Theodosius, and remained at the head of his partisans.

(2) Liberatus, speaking of this condemnation of John of Antioch, says: "Therefore, Cyril

condemned the wicked *Symbol* of Theodore of Mopsueste, of whom we shall hear more when treating of the Controversy of the Three Chapters. The remaining *Actions* were devoted to cases of discipline respecting particular dioceses.

The office of "protector of the Church," of "external bishop," of "executor of the canons," &c., which the Roman Christian emperors, with the willing consent of the Popes, exercised in the early ages, was sometimes productive of serious evil. These sovereigns did not always observe, if indeed they always knew, the line of demarcation which separates the province of a protector from that of a ruler. And not unfrequently, the ignorance of theology and of most ecclesiastical matters, which must, almost from the nature of things, be part and parcel of the equipments of a more or less military autocrat, rendered the emperor a facile tool in the hands of ambitious churchmen and of theologistic courtiers. Theodosius the Younger was styled by the authors of his day "a most religious man," and yet he was sometimes led to exceed his authority, and to cause much trouble to the Church, though he wished to protect her. While his imperial mind was yet perplexed by the contrary *Relations* of the Ephesine Council and of the conciliabulars of John of Antioch, the fathers of the Synod thought best to send him ambassadors who would explain to him the true state of affairs. But three days before these arrived at Constantinople, the Count Irenaeus, a friend of Nestorius and of John, had come from Ephesus, and when they presented themselves to Theodosius, they found his mind preoccupied with prejudice against their cause. He allowed the two parties to dispute the case of John in a public audience, but the result was that he ordered his almoner, Count John, to return to Ephesus, to regard Cyril, Memnon, and Nestorius, as all three deposed, and to settle matters peacefully. Count John's first act was to arrest the three bishops, giving Cyril and Memnon to the care of one officer, and Nestorius to that of another. Horrified at this action, the

and Memnon, wishing to be revenged, condemned John and all who agreed with him, and with similar arrogance, visited both with many evils at Ephesus." *Brev.*, c. 6. But this author was a stern defender of the "Three Chapters," and, therefore, naturally hostile to the memory of St. Cyril.

fathers chose a faithful messenger, and to elude the vigilance of the partisans of Nestorius, they enclosed their new letter to the emperor in the hollow of a reed. In this epistle they firmly refused to communicate with John of Antioch and his brethren before these assented to the condemnation of Nestorius; they begged for the liberation of Cyril and Memnon, and asked the sovereign to receive and patiently listen to a new embassy they would send. In the reed they also enclosed a letter to all the bishops then in the capital, and to its clergy. The consequence was that Theodosius was so beset with supplications, that he decided to receive a delegation of seven from each side. He met the legates at Chalcedon, and having heard their respective arguments as to the validity of the *Acts* of Ephesus, the hopes of the Antiochians were crushed. On the 25th Oct., of the same year, 451, Maximian, a man of pure faith and confirmed piety, was consecrated bishop of Constantinople (1).

As for the convocation of the Council of Ephesus, Roncaglia, who labored strenuously to neutralize the Gallicanisms of the great work of Alexandre, feels compelled to admit that "it is difficult to prove, from the monuments of ecclesiastical history, that the Ephesine Synod assembled at the orders of Pope Cælestine. But there is no doubt that the Council is called legitimate, not because it was convoked by the emperor, but because at least the after-consent of the Roman Pontiff was accorded, since the right of calling General Councils belongs only to him who rules the whole Church, as Alexandre himself well shows in his dissertation on the convocation of the Council of Nice." The remarks which we made, when speaking of the convocation of the Nicene Synod, and which we shall have occasion to repeat when treating of that of the Council of Chalcedon, may also apply to the indiction of the Ephesine Synod. There is no doubt as to the presidency of this Council, for the *Acts* plainly show that until the arrival of the other legates of Rome, St. Cyril presided by virtue of his

(1) In the following year, John of Antioch signed a Confession of Faith drawn up by St. Cyril. Nestorius died in exile, in an oasis of Libya, about the year 440.

appointment by the Pontiff to hold his place in all matters relating to Nestorius ; they also show that after the advent of Arcadius, Projectus, and Philip, all presided in unison.

The authors of the Gallican, Aulic, and Protestant schools contend that in the Council of Ephesus, it was the action of the fathers that impressed upon the mind of the Catholic world the fact that the doctrine of Nestorius was heretical, and not the action of the Roman Pontiff. They hold that the reformability of a Papal decree by a General Council is shown in this instance, for, they say, the fathers of Ephesus examined the letters of Pope Cælestine to Cyril before they assented to them. We answer that the bishops certainly did order the letters to be read ; the documents were issued to be acted upon, and therefore they had to be examined. But, as we shall have occasion again to say, when treating of other Councils, a judicial and critical examination is one thing, and an examination for information is another ; the reading of the Pontifical letters at Ephesus belonged to the latter, not to the former category. If we read attentively the letters of Cælestine and Cyril, and the *Acts* of the Council, we must conclude that the Pontiff regarded the cause of Nestorius as finished before the Synod met ; that so it was looked upon by Cyril and the fathers. Then of what use was the Council ? Why so much trouble, expense, and danger ? Not, certainly, for a definitive judgment of the cause, but in order that, by a manifestation of the will of the entire episcopate, the audacity of heresy might be the more easily checked, and error more readily refuted. Again, a Pontifical definition is made to be received, and to be received solemnly, and submissively, and officially ; there is no way of doing this so appropriate and effective as that furnished by a General Council.

Nothing can be more certain than that Pope Cælestine did not hand over the cause of Nestorius to the will of the Council ; he simply ordered that it should do what was necessary to carry into effect the decision he had already given at Rome. In his instructions to his legates, he said, "You will in all things consult our brother, the bishop Cyril (already made Papal legate), and you will perform what-

ever you see to be in his power to decide ; and we command that the authority of the Holy See be respected. For the instructions, which you have received, tell you that you must be present at the Council ; *if they come to a disputation, you must judge among their opinions, and not undergo a struggle.*” These words, which are as literally those of Cælestine as merely decent translation will permit, certainly show that he regarded his decision as definitive. In his epistle to the Ephesine prelates, he says : “ On account of our solicitude, we have sent to you our brother priests, the bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and the priest Philip, who are of one mind with ourselves, who will be present at all that is done, and who will execute what we have established.” This epistle was brought to the Council by the legates themselves, and as they did not arrive until after the condemnation of Nestorius, the fathers had acted before they read it. Nevertheless, in pronouncing sentence in the first *Action*, the bishops said, “ Compelled by the holy canons, and by the epistle of our Most Holy Father and co-minister Cælestine, bishop of the Roman Church, and covered with tears, we necessarily come to the sorrowful sentence against Nestorius.” The epistle here mentioned must have been the one sent to St. Cyril long before the Council ; hence, we conclude that the Synod thought the decree of Cælestine definitive. Again, in the second *Action*, Firmus, bishop of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, said to the Apostolic legates, “ The Holy Apostolic See, through the letters of Cælestine sent to the most religious bishops, Cyril of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, &c., before the present business, prescribed the sentence and the rule which we have followed. . . . . since Nestorius has not appeared when cited by us, we have put into execution that form, pronouncing against him the canonical and apostolic judgment.” And if we consider the conduct of the Papal legates in the second *Action*, our position is still more secure. They presented the following demand : “ We request that you order to be made known to us that which has been done in this Holy Synod before our coming, in order that in accordance with the decree of our Blessed Pope, and with that of this present holy

company, we also may confirm it . . . . . that following the formula of the Most Holy Pope Cælestine, who has committed this task unto us, we may confirm the judgments of your holiness." Here the legates declare that the decree of the Council must be *confirmed* by them ; is not that a clear assertion of the Papal superiority ? And the fathers acquiesced.

In the first *Action*, the Ephesine fathers speak of Nestorius as "most reverend" and "most religious," but this does not prove that they disregarded the decree of Cælestine. As yet Nestorius had not been condemned, when these terms were used ; up to the very moment of his sentence, he enjoyed a strict right to receive the terms of courtesy and respect due to his elevated position as bishop of Constantinople. Nor can it be urged that the Pontiff had decreed his deposition if he did not recant within ten days from his receipt of the decree ; that therefore the use of such respectful terms towards him implies an ignoring of the Papal sentence. For we know from the last letter of the Pope to St. Cyril, that a further delay of time had been mercifully accorded. This letter was read in the second *Action*, and contains the following passage : "Thou askest whether the Holy Synod ought to receive a man who condemns what it teaches, and whether the sentence yet holds good, now that the time of delay has elapsed. Upon this matter, let us together consult our common Lord. Does He not instantly answer by the prophet, that he does not wish the death of the dying, and by the apostle Paul, that he wishes every man to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of truth ? . . . . . I study Catholic peace ; I study the salvation of the perishing one, if he is willing to avow his malady . . . . . If he is to perish, let him see that you are not quick to shed blood, when he knows that a remedy is extended to him."

Having briefly sketched the course and significance of the Council of Ephesus, we will in a few words indicate the fortunes of Nestorianism after the definitive condemnation of its leader. We refer the reader who desires a fuller account than our limits permit us to give, to the valuable Dic-

tionary of Bergier. Proscribed by the Roman emperors, the Nestorians sought the protection of the Persian monarchs, and the enmity of the two states proved favorable to them. They founded celebrated schools at Edessa, and established the patriarchate of Seleucia. When Mohammedanism overran the Eastern countries, the conquerors proved quite lenient towards the Nestorians, then called "Oriental Christians," and even under that savage regime they preserved enough vitality to send their missionaries into China, establishing missions which lasted until the thirteenth century. At this day, Nestorianism is professed by the schismatic portion of the Chaldean Christians, and, according to Mosheim, it is to their immortal honor that they are the only Eastern Christians who have avoided the superstitions of the Greek and Latin churches. When Mosheim made this assertion, he knew that the modern Nestorians agreed with the Mother Church in teaching seven sacraments, transubstantiation, the worship of saints, prayer for the dead. And as for what he calls their purity of doctrine, he knew that they teach that our souls are created before our bodies ; that they deny original sin ; that they teach that not until the last day do we receive our final award ; that they hold that hell is not eternal. It is worthy of note, since Protestants have such sympathy for all the Orientals who hold aloof from Rome, that in their liturgy the Nestorians persist in the use of a "dead language" ; they never use the vernacular, but always the ancient Syriac, following the custom of all the other schismatic churches of the East, not one of which has its liturgy in the language of its people. Nor should we omit to note that these Nestorian Christians regard as canonical precisely the same books of Scripture which Rome presents to her children, and if our Protestant friends would reflect a little upon this fact, they would not be so confident that their canon of Scripture is correct (1). There have been several tentatives of reconciliation with Rome on the part of the Nestorians. Thus, in the year 1304, their patriarch Iaballaha sent a profession of ortho-

(1) Another fact should be noted by the Protestant friends of these Asiatic schismatics. During the seven hundred years of the Nestorian missions in Tartary, they never presented their converts with a Tartar version of the Bible. This was done, however, by a Franciscan friar in the fourteenth century.

doxy to Pope Benedict XI. ; in the pontificate of Pius IV., the patriarch Sulaka did the same ; the latter's successor, Ehed-jesus, came to Rome and made his abjuration, received from the Supreme Pontiff the pallium, and returning home, made many converts. In the year 1771, Dominican missionaries received into the fold the Nestorian patriarch, then resident at Mozul, and five of his suffragan bishops. From that time to the present, there has been a flourishing Chaldean church in communion with Rome, and governed by its own patriarch. And now for a few words upon those Nestorians who are known in history as the "Christians of St. Thomas." In the year 1500, the Portuguese, having doubled the Cape of Good Hope, and penetrated into India, were thunder-struck on coming upon a community of Christians on the coast of Malabar. These people called themselves "Christians of St. Thomas," and had for a pastor only a bishop who was sent to them by the Nestorian patriarch of Mozul. They declared that their ancestors had been converted by the Apostle, St. Thomas (1), but, according to Govea, the Augustinian historian of the mission which John of Albuquerque, archbishop of Goa, seconded by the Jesuits, established among them, they erred in many things besides the doctrine of the Incarnation. Their very errors, however, furnish good arguments to Catholic controversialists, for in them all can be traced an original belief in the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Some Protestant authors have endeavored to show, by means of these "Christians of St. Thomas," that primitive Christianity must have been more Protestant than Catholic. If Protestants hold the necessity of an episcopal hierarchy, if they believe in Transubstantiation and in confession, if they enforce the celibacy of their bishops, and devoutly observe the fasts of Lent, &c., then they may be of some kith and kin with these Nestorians. At present, the Malabar Christians number about three hundred thousand ; less than fifty thousand are Nestorians, and the rest are about equally divided between the Latin and Syriac rites of the Roman Church. Those of the latter rite have native priests.

(1) Bergier shows, under the article ST. THOMAS, that their assertion has some fair arguments in its favor.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

### THE FAITH PREACHED BY ST. PATRICK.

"Is it not known to all that the things which have been delivered to the Roman Church by Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and preserved ever since, should be observed by all; and that nothing is to be introduced, devoid of authority, or borrowed elsewhere? Especially as it is manifest that no one has founded churches for all Italy, the Gauls, Spain, Africa, and the interjacent islands, except such priests as were appointed by the venerable Peter and his successors?"

(1) From the earliest times, the Roman Pontiffs constantly carried out the commission of our Lord to feed His lambs, and all the Northern nations of Europe were converted by their missionaries. It is unknown when the name of Christ was first carried to Ireland, but during the Pontificate of Cælestine I. (422-432), the islanders were not numbered among Christian peoples. According to the *Chronicle* of St. Prosper, published about the year 434, "Palladius was ordained by Pope Cælestine, and sent as first bishop to the Irish (2) believing in Christ." The *Life of St. Patrick*, in the *Book of Armagh*, written by Muirchu-Maccu-Mactheni before the year 700, records that "Palladius, archdeacon of Pope Cælestine, bishop of Rome, and 45th successor of St. Peter in the Apostolic See, was ordained and sent to convert this island, lying under wintry cold. But he was unsuccessful, for no one can receive anything from earth unless it be given to him from heaven; and neither did these fierce barbarians receive his doctrine readily, nor did he wish to remain long in a land not his own; wherefore, he returned to him who sent him. On his way, however, after passing

(1) *Pope St. Innocent I.; Epistle to Decentius.*

(2) The text has *ad Scotos*, but, as we had occasion to remark, when treating of the Paschal controversy, in the fifth century Ireland was the only land known by the name of *Scotia*. "Even in the time of Pede," says Dr. Todd, "*Scotia* meant no country but Ireland, and *Scoti* no people but the inhabitants of Ireland." See Todd's *St. Patrick*, p. 282.

the first sea, having begun his land journey, he died in the territory of the Britains." The scholiast on St. Fiacc's Hymn (1), whose writings the best Celtic philologists refer to the 7th or 8th century, says, that landing in Wicklow, Palladius "founded some churches, *Teach-na-Roman*, or House of the Romans, *Killfine*, and others. Nevertheless, he was not well received by the people, but was forced to sail around the coast towards the north, until he was driven by a tempest to the land of the Picts, where he founded the church of Fordun; and there he is known by the name of Pledi" (2). But with the advent of St. Patrick, the light of Christianity shone upon Ireland. Probably born, certainly brought up, near Boulogne-sur-Mer (*Bonaven Taberniae*, say the *Confessions*), in France, Patrick was led a captive to Ireland, and sold as a slave to a chieftain named Milchu (3). When in his twenty-second year, he gained his liberty, and dedicated himself to God in the monastery of Marmontier, near Tours. After a few years, he went to the "blessed island" of Lerins, the founder of which holy retreat, St. Honoratus, was still living; among his companions at this monastery, were Sts. Hilary of Arles, Eucherius of Lyons, and Lupus of Troyes, together with the famous author, Vincent of Lerins. When, in 429, Sts. Germain of Auxerre and Lupus of Troyes were sent by Pope Cælestine to combat Pelagianism in Britain, Patrick accompanied them, thus receiving his first training for the apostolate under the guidance of the legate of the Holy See. St. Palladius was at this time destined for the Irish mission, and St. Germain thought that Patrick, from his knowledge of the language and customs of the people would be a valuable acquisition to the apostolic messenger,

(1) The learned Irish archaeologist, George Petrie, says that it is itself given in MSS. which cannot be later than the ninth. *Essay on Tara*, p. 71.

(2) COLGAN; *Trias Thaum.*, p. 5. The reader will notice that Palladius did not reach the "land of the Picts" (modern *Scotland*), until after he had sailed around the island of the "Scots," and been driven thence by a tempest. We draw his attention to the conclusion, although there is no longer any doubt among the learned in such matters, that, before the eleventh century, the term *Scotia* was applied only to Ireland, the proper name of Scotland being *Caledoniā*. The latter country changed its name to Scotland, only after its colonization by the Scots or Irish.

(3) The most ancient authority, St. Fiacc, mentions *Nemthur* as Patrick's birthplace, and the *Three Lives* identify *Nemthur* and the *Campus Taberniae*. Probus says that the *Vicus Bannave Taburniae* region was in *Neutrid*. On the other hand, the scholiast on St. Fiacc's Hymn, and the *Tripartite Life* say that *Nemthur* was the same as *Alcluda*; hence Usher asserted that Patrick was borne at Alclud in Scotland, now Dumbarton. The 4th *Life* seems to reconcile these conflicting statements, identifying *Nemthur* with Armoric *Bonavem*, and adding that it was in the district of *Strato-clud*, or Alclud. MORAN; *Early Irish Church*, p. 9.

"St. Patrick," writes Probus "poured forth to God the following prayer: 'O Lord Jesus Christ, lead me, I beseech Thee, to the seat of the Holy Roman Church, that, *receiving authority there* to preach with confidence Thy sacred truths, the Irish nation may, through my ministry, be gathered to the fold of Christ.' And soon after, being about to proceed to Ireland, this man of God, Patrick, went, as he had wished, to Rome, the head of all churches, and having asked and received the Apostolic blessing, he returned by the same road by which he had gone thither" (1). Having secured the consent and blessing of Pope Cælestine for his future labors, Patrick journeyed back to Auxerre to see his patron, St. Germain; he then left for his mission, but, hearing, on the way, that St. Palladius had died, he paused to receive episcopal consecration at the hands of Amatorex (2). He finally set out for Ireland in the summer of 432, accompanied by Analius, Iserninus, and some others. It is not within our province to enter into the particulars of St. Patrick's wonderful career. It is more or less familiar to every Catholic, and for such Protestants as have agiological tastes, there is access to many biographies of value. We propose, however, to treat of some questions concerning the great apostle, which have been mooted by certain Protestants of the Anglican and Presbyterian schools—questions which, though calculated merely to provoke a smile on the part of one ordinarily well versed in historical matters, yet have been seriously proposed, and, by many, willingly entertained. The subject matter of our investigations has engaged the pens of many erudite and zealous critics, but, to our mind, no writer has so well succeeded as Dr. Moran, in his learned work on the early Irish church (3). We can do no better than avail ourselves of his patient and discriminating research, and refer the reader, if he desires fuller information,

(1) Probus' *Life of St. Patrick*, in Colgan's *Trias Thaum.*, p. 49.

(2) It is difficult to determine the identity of this prelate. Some of the old biographies call him Amator. Moran conjectures that he was St. Lupus of Troyes. The old Latin treatise on the Irish Liturgy says that, after Cælestine, Sts. Germain and Lupus had the chief part in sending St. Patrick to Ireland.

(3) *Essays on the Origin, Doctrines, and Discipline of the Early Irish Church*, by Rev. Dr. Moran, Vice Rector of the Irish College, and professor of Hebrew in the Propaganda, Rome; now archbishop of Sydney.

to a really interesting and exhaustive treatise (1). The less complete, but yet instructive essay by Gaffney, entitled *The Ancient Irish Church*, may also be recommended to the student.

The first, and certainly the most amusing, question which is raised with regard to St. Patrick, is whether or not he belongs to the mythical region occupied by the British Arthur, the Popess Joan, and William Tell. The existence of our saint was denied for the first time by Ledwich (2) who based his assertion on the assumption that the great missionary was unknown to all who wrote previous to the ninth century. This foolish theory can soon be dismissed, for, says Moran, "All the Christian traditions of Ireland are clustered around the memory of St. Patrick. Her hills, and islands, and streamlets, and fountains re-echo his name. Every monument that traces the line of separation between Christianity and Paganism in Ireland, rests for its basis on his existence. And hence, even should we suppose the assumption of Dr. Ledwich, as regards the silence of her early records, to be true, yet it would not suffice to warrant the conclusion which he would fain deduce from it." But the would-be skeptic is wrong in his assertion that St. Patrick was known to no writer before the ninth century. In the eighth century, Ængus, in his *Felire*, marks the feast of St. Patrick (3). The Irish "Collection of Canons," preserved in MSS. of the same century, contains decrees enacted by him. The famous Stowe Missal, which Dr. Todd admits to be at least of that period, has St. Patrick's name in the Litany. Alcuin calls him the "glory of the Scottish race." In the seventh century, Adamnan speaks of a bishop who was "the disciple of holy bishop Patrick" (4). The Antiphonary of Bangor, composed before the year 691 (5), has a "Hymn of St. Patrick, Teacher of the Scots." St. Cummian Fota (d. 661), left a Hymn in honor of the

(1) The reader may also consult with profit Lanigan's *Ecclesiastical History*, the works issued by the Irish Archaeological Society, and O'Curry's *MS. Materials of Irish History*.

(2) *Antiquities of Ireland*.

(3) CURRY; *Lectures*, p. 368. PETRIE; *Essay on Tara*, p. 89.

(4) REEVES; *Columba*.

(5) LANIGAN; *Eccles. Hist.*, v. 1, p. 59.

Apostles, the sixteenth strophe of which is devoted to St. Patrick. St. Cummian Albus, abbot of Iona, in his life of the founder, speaks, at the very beginning, of "St. Patrick, first apostle of Ireland." In an Irish poem by St. Cuimin of Connor, one verse is devoted to the fasting of "Patrick, of Ardmacha's city, the son of Calphurn." In the letter of the abbot of Durrow on the Paschal controversy, written in 634, one of the arguments for the use of the Roman computation is that it was used by "our father Patrick" (1). In the sixth century, St. Columba, the Irish apostle of Scotland, terminates his transcription of the Gospels, with a prayer to "the holy bishop Patrick" (2). Some of the Saint's deeds are commemorated in the Hymn of St. Fiacc, even the Scholia to which Usher ascribes to the sixth century. St. Fiacc refers to still earlier records regarding St. Patrick, and the *Tripartite Life*, supposed to be by St. Evin, gives customs and proverbs originating in the apostle's deeds and teaching. So much for the assertion that St. Patrick was unknown to all who wrote before the ninth century.

We now come to the nature of the doctrine preached by St. Patrick. A certain class of Protestants in Ireland noisily proclaim that the religion taught by our saint was not that at present held by the Irish masses; that, in fine, the doctrines now presented by the Anglican establishment were those inculcated by him, and that this institution itself is the self-same church founded by the apostle (3). In refutation of this theory, we shall now examine, firstly, into the senti-

(1) USHER; *Sylloges Epp.* ep. 11.

(2) WESTWOOD; *Paleogr. Sac.* O'CONOR; *Writers*, 1—182.

(3) The London *Times*, of May 20th, 1863, gives the following remarks of James Whiteside, M. P., in the House of Commons: "If I were asked to say why I maintain that branch of the church which exists in Ireland, my answer would be, plainly and directly, that I maintain it because I believe it upholds the ancient, pure, Catholic, faith which was professed in Ireland, centuries before the English set foot in that country. The ablest scholars, the best divines, the soundest antiquaries, are agreed upon that point; and no man has proved it more logically, or more conclusively, than Canon Wordsworth, in the series of discourses which he delivered in Westminster Abbey, for the purpose of establishing our claim to be the true descendants of the ancient Catholic Church in Ireland. That man is profoundly ignorant who attacks the ancient church in Ireland. The question between us and the Roman Catholics is, which of us most nearly conforms to that church? Few will venture to deny that the argument of the divine who compared the ancient creed with that which we repeat every Sabbath-day—who showed that the Nicene Creed agrees, in substance, with that established by St. Patrick—was conclusive; and, therefore, I maintain that the church in Ireland preserves the old, ancient, true, Catholic faith" (cheers). The cool impudence of this assumption is only equalled by the audacity that appeals to "the ablest scholars and antiquaries" for help in sustaining it. Was such the opinion of O'Donovan, by far the best Irish antiquarian of the age? Was O'Curry, the best historian of ancient Ireland, of this belief?

ments of the early Irish Christians in regard to the Roman See.

"As true," says Wilde, "as that the Irish people were governed by their own kings and princes, and were amenable to their own laws and Brehons only, up to the middle of the twelfth century, so true is it that the Irish Catholic church was independent of all foreign rule, in either temporal or spiritual matters, until the beginning of that period" (1). With regard to any temporal suzerainty of the Roman Pontiff over Ireland, either before or after the twelfth century, we have nothing to say. We propose to decide this question—Was the spiritual supremacy of the Pope of Rome acknowledged by the early Irish church? We shall prove that it was, firstly, because the Irish church was founded by the Church of Rome, and accepted her doctrines, one of which was the Papal supremacy; secondly, because that supremacy was expressly avowed by the early Irish ecclesiastical writers, and attested by the canonical enactments of the early Irish church; thirdly, because it was the custom of the early Irish church to appeal to the Holy See, and to be guided by its decisions. As to the foundation of the Irish church, Usher admits the Roman mission of Sts. Palladius and Patrick. "From the first legation of Palladius and Patricius, *who were sent to plant the faith* in this country, it cannot be shown out of any monument of antiquity, that the bishop of Rome ever sent any of his legates before Gillebertus," &c. (2). Nor could Usher avoid the admission, for Eric of Auxerre, a French monk of the ninth century, says of St. Patrick, that "as Germain saw him magnanimous in religion, eminent for virtue, strenuous in the sacred ministry, and thinking it unfit that so strong a husbandman should be listless in the cultivation of God's harvest, he sent him to holy Cælestine, the Pope of the city of Rome, accompanied by his own priest, Segetius, who might bear witness to his ecclesiastical probity at the Apostolic See. Being thus approved by its judgment, leaning on its authority, and strengthened by its blessing, he journeyed to Ireland, and being given to that people as its chosen apostle, he illustrated

(1) *Boyne and Blackwater*, p. 281. (2) *Religion of Ancient Irish*, c. VIII.

the whole nation at that time, indeed, by his preaching and miracles, as he continues to do at the present day, and will continue forever to illustrate it by the wonderful privileges of his apostolate." Mark the Anchorite wrote his *History of the Britons* in 822, and in it we find a short sketch of the life of our saint, which may justly be taken as deriving from the most authentic records (1). "Under divine guidance Patrick was instructed in the sacred Scriptures, and then he went to Rome and remained there a long time, studying, and being filled with the Holy Ghost, learning the holy Scriptures and the Sacred Mysteries. And whilst he was there applying himself to these pursuits, Palladius was sent by Pope Cælestine as first bishop to convert the Irish to Christ; but God, by some storms and signs, prevented his success; and no one can receive aught on earth, unless it be given to him from above. This Palladius, returning from Ireland to Britain, died there in the land of the Picts. The death of bishop Palladius being known, the patricians Theodosius and Valentinian being the Roman rulers, Patrick was sent by Pope Cælestine, the angel of God, Victor, accompanying, guiding, and assisting him, and by bishop German, to convert the Irish to the belief in the Holy Trinity." The ancient and most authentic of the Irish annalists also derive the mission of St. Patrick from the Holy See. Thus, the Four Masters write: "St. Patrick was ordained to the episcopacy by the holy Pope Cælestine, the first who commissioned him to come to Ireland and preach, and give to the Irish the precepts of faith and religion" (2). And the Annals of Innisfallen say that "Patrick came from Rome, bishop, into Ireland, and devoutly preached here the faith of Christ" (3). The Annals of Ulster begin: "In the year from the Incarnation of our Lord 431, Palladius was by Pope Cælestine ordained bishop of the Irish, Ætius and Valerian being consuls. He was the first that was sent to Ireland that they might be converted to Christ. . . . In the year 432, Patrick came to Ireland in the ninth year of Theodosius the Younger

(1) "*History of the Britons by the Anchorite Mark*;" from a Vatican MS. of the 10th century, and published in 1819, by W. Gun, London.

(2) *Four Masters*, by O'Donovan, y. 432.

(3) An interesting account of these Annals is given in Curry's *Lectures*, p. 75.

and first of the episcopacy of Sixtus. Sixtus was the forty-second bishop of Rome, as Bede, and Marcellin, and Isidore reckon in their chronicles . . . . In the year 439, Secundinus, Auxilius, and Iserninus, were sent as bishops into Ireland to assist St. Patrick." The great chronicle of Marianus Scotus, which the Anglican Reeves admits to be "the most elaborate historical production of the middle ages, and always enjoying the highest encomiums of the learned" (1), was composed in the eleventh century (2). It thus chronicles the mission of St. Patrick: "In the eighth year of Theodosius, Bassus and Antiochus being consuls, Palladius was ordained by Pope Cælestine, and sent as first bishop to the Irish believing in Christ. After him was sent St. Patrick, who, being a Briton by birth, was consecrated by Pope St. Cælestine, and sent to the archiepiscopate of Ireland. There, during sixty years, he confirmed his preaching by signs and miracles, and converted the whole island to the faith of Christ." St. Patrick himself refers to the See of Peter as the source of Ireland's Christianity (3). He thus exhorts his converts: "Thanks be to God, you have passed from the kingdom of Satan to the city of God; the church of the Irish is a church of Romans; as you are children of Christ, so be you children of Rome." The great Columbanus wrote to the Roman Pontiff, less than a hundred years from the death of St. Patrick, that "The Catholic faith is held unshaken by us as it was delivered to us by you, the successors of the holy Apostles" (4). The *Leabhar Breac*, described by the Protestant Petrie as "the oldest and best Irish MS. relating to Church history now preserved, or which perhaps the Irish ever, possessed" (5), and which is certainly the chief collection of religious compositions extant in Gaelic, gives the following attestation of the Roman commission of Palladius and Patrick: "The year that Patrick came to Ireland was the 433rd

(1) Translation of *Wattenbach's Irish Monasteries in Germany*, p. 13, note q.

(2) The proper name of Marianus Scotus was Maelbrigte (servant of Bridget). Born in Ulster in 1028, he became a monk in 1052, and four years later, entered the Irish monastery of St. Martin at Cologne. He removed to Mentz in 1069, and there worked out his great Chronicle. The autograph copy, with Marianus' signature, is preserved in the Vatican.

(3) *Sayings of St. Patrick*, in the Book of Armagh. This celebrated book was transcribed in 807, and was then believed to have been originally written by St. Patrick. This has been skillfully proved by the Protestant Graves. See Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, Nov. 30, 1846.

(4) *Epistle to Boniface IV.*

(5) *Tara*, p. 74.

from the Incarnation, in the 9th year of the reign of Theodosius, king of the world, and in the 1st year of the episcopacy of Sixtus, the successor of Peter, and in the 4th year of the reign of Leoghaire Mac Niall, at Tara, and in the 60th year of his own age. For sixty years he baptized and instructed the men of Erin, as Fiace says, 'He preached, for three score years, the crucifixion of Christ to the tribes of the Feni.' And here is the character given by Heloran of Patrick, at the time when he brought an account of him to Clonard: 'Meek and great was the son of Calphurn, a vine-branch laden with fruit'. . . . Palladius was sent by Pope Cælestine with a gospel for Patrick to preach it to the Irish. This was the 401st year from the crucifixion of Christ (1). In the year after this, Patrick went to preach in Ireland, Ætius and Valerius being consuls. It was in this year that Sixtus assumed the supremacy of Rome after Cælestine, and it was the 4th of the reign of Leoghaire, son of Niall, at Tara." From all these authorities it is evident that the Irish church was founded by the Church of Rome, and was a daughter of that Church.

We now propose to show that the early Irish church turned to Rome with filial reverence, and acknowledged the divinely guaranteed authority of the Holy See. This is evinced, firstly, from the writings of early Irish ecclesiastics. In the old Irish monastery of Reichenau, the eminent antiquarian, Francis Mone, discovered, a few years ago, some valuable Irish MSS. of the 8th and 9th centuries, in which were contained two Hymns very pertinent to our thesis (2). In the first, St. Peter "holds the place of Christ, and feeds His sacred fold;" he is styled "the foundation of the Universal Christian Church;" he is pronounced "the legislator of the Most High;" and he is adorned with "the aureola of Rome, in which city he is destined to reign with an ever-enduring triumph." In the second, the Apostle is called the key-bearer of the heavenly kingdom, for all time; he is the pontiff of souls, the shepherd of all the fold of Christ. St. Cum-

(1) The Irish writers generally assign the crucifixion to the year 31 of the vulgar era. For reason of discrepancy, see *Alexandre's Dissert.* II., in 1st Cent.

(2) *Latin Hymns of the Middle Ages*; Freiburg, 1855.

mian Fota (1), born in 590, of whom the scholiast on the *Feliré* of Ængus says that, when he and other saints prayed to God for different graces, that of wisdom fell to Cumman, has the following passage, in a Hymn on the Apostles: "Rejoice, O New Jerusalem! Solemnize the gladsome festivals of Christ, and exult in the commemorations of the Apostles—of Peter the key-bearer, the first pastor, the mystic fisherman, who, with the Gospel-net, draws in the spiritual fish of Christ." The *Penitential* of this same St. Cumman Fota (the Tall) was the basis of many similar codes in the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries (2). In this work, the saint shows how, in his time, contempt for Roman customs was punished. Having prescribed a fast of forty days for any pastor who, through ignorance, allows a heretic to say Mass in his church, and having extended the fast to a year, if the heresy is public, he adds: "But should he thus permit any individual to celebrate, through contempt for the Catholic Church, and for the customs of Rome, he himself shall be cast off as a heretic, unless he do penance, and his penance shall last for ten years." One of the most important monuments of the Irish church is the *Missal of St. Columbanus* (3), first published by Mabillon in 1724, and the MS. of which the learned Benedictine judged to be then "more than a thousand years old" (4). In the Mass assigned in this *Missal* to the feast of the Chair of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles is said to hold "the keys of heaven, the dignity of the Pontifical chair; so great a power, that what he binds, none can loosen, and what he loosens, shall be loosed also in heaven; a throne of exalted dignity, where he will sit in judgment on all the nations of the earth." And the first Collect of the same Mass says, "Oh God! who on this day didst give to St. Peter, after Thyself, the headship of the whole Church, we humbly pray Thee, that as Thou didst constitute him pastor for the safety of the flock, and that Thy sheep might be preserved from error, so now Thou may-

(1) His contemporaries styled him the Gregory the Great of Ireland.

(2) In his Appendix III., Dr. Moran proves that this *Penitential* cannot be ascribed to any other author than St. Cumman the Tall.

(3) Brought from Bobbio to the Ambrosian Library by Cardinal Frederick Borromeo.

(4) *Italian Museum*, v. 1.

est save us through his intercession." "The monastery of Bangor," says Moran, "was the school of sanctity from which Columbanus went forth, towards the close of the sixth century, to renew the well-nigh spent civilization of Gaul, Germany, and Italy. The memory of few of the Irish saints has been better preserved on the continent than that of Columbanus, and of none do so many written memorials still remain. It is owing to this circumstance that we are able to enter more fully into an examination of his teaching concerning the prerogatives of the Holy See, than we have done in regard to the other ancient writers of the Irish church. Indeed, his letter to Pope Boniface is so replete with expressions of reverential devotedness to Rome, that it is difficult to refrain from quoting the whole of that noble document. Our saint had just settled in North Italy, and on every side was encompassed by those who warmly defended the well-known schism of the 'Three Chapters.' King Agilulf, at whose request St. Columbanus wrote this letter to the Pontiff, was himself the patron of the schismatics, and hence the holy man, fearing lest he might, perhaps, be betrayed into some error by the influence of those who surrounded him, at the very outset of his letter declares that whatever 'he shall say useful or orthodox, was to be reputed to the Pontiff's praise, but if any word, perchance, should bear the impress of intemperate zeal, it was to be referred 'not to any insubordination, but to his own individual lack of wisdom and discretion.' " The letter is addressed to "the most beautiful Head of all the churches of the whole of Europe; to the beloved Pope; the exalted prelate; the most reverend overseer; the pastor of pastors," &c. The Pontiffs are designated as "the masters, the steersmen, the mystic pilots of the spiritual ship, that is, the Church." Of the Irish people, he says: "We are the scholars of Sts. Peter and Paul, and of all disciples subscribing by the Holy Ghost to the divine canon; all are Irish, inhabitants of the remotest part of the whole world, receiving nothing save what is Evangelic and Apostolic doctrine. None of us has been a heretic, none a Jew, none a schismatic; but the faith, just as it was at first delivered by you, the successors of the

holy Apostles, is held unshaken. . . . . *We are, as I said before, bound to the Chair of St. Peter. For although Rome is great and illustrious, yet it is only through this Chair that she is great and renowned amongst us.*"

The Anglican Murray (1) says that the language of this letter is "too strong to allow us to suppose that the Irish monk, who used it, considered Pope Boniface, whom he was addressing, to be the head of the Church." And yet the writer expressly styles the Pontiff "pastor of pastors," and if he writes with that energy which might be expected from one who had grown old in the apostolate, he adds, as though anticipating Murray's objection, "therefore, freely will I speak, for I address our spiritual masters, the steersmen and pilots of the mystic ship." Murray also asserts that St. Columbanus says "it is possible for the see of Rome to forfeit Apostolic honor by not preserving the Apostolic faith." This is a deliberate falsification of the text (2), which reads: "That you may not lack Apostolic honor, preserve the Apostolic faith, confirm," &c. The idea of Columbanus is, that if the Pontiff were slow in repressing heresy, he would merit reproach, not praise; but he does not insinuate that, even then, the supremacy of the See would be affected. When our saint summons Boniface to "preserve the Apostolic faith," he addresses him as the universal pastor. "The sheep," he says, "are affrighted by the approach of wolves; wherefore use, O Pope, the whistlings and well-known voice of the true shepherd, and stand between the sheep and the wolves, so that, casting away their fear, the sheep may in everything find thee the first pastor. . . . . Set, in a manner, higher than all mortals, and exalted near unto the celestial beings, lift up thy voice as a trumpet, that thou mayest show their wicked doings to the people of thy Lord, entrusted to thee by Him." Claude, bishop of Auxerre, better known as Claudius Clemens, an Irish writer of the ninth century, is the next to whose testimony we

(1) Dean of Ardagh, and author of a "History of Ireland and her Church."

(2) "*Ut ergo honore Apostolico non careas, conserva fidem Apostolicam, confirma testimonio,*" etc.

would draw attention. In his *Commentary on the Gospels* (1), there are some passages which Usher tries to endow with a Protestant sense, by dint of omitting the context, or by forced interpretation (2). Among the passages omitted, is the following: "To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The word *key*, then, does not here refer to anything material formed by the hand of man, but it indicates the judiciary power. He who with a zeal greater than the rest, acknowledged Christ, was deservedly, in a special manner, endowed with the keys of the kingdom of heaven." This also is omitted: "But blessed Peter, who had acknowledged Christ in the fulness of faith, and loved Him with a true love, received, in a special manner, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the *princeps* of judiciary authority, that thus all the faithful throughout the universe might understand, that *whosoever in any manner separates himself from the unity of his faith and communion, such a one can neither be absolved from the bonds of sin, nor enter the portals of the kingdom of heaven.*" We would remind the reader of the testimony of St. Cummin the hermit (3), whom, when treating of the Paschal question, we cited as saying, "An old authority," says Jerome, 'rises up against me. Meanwhile, I shout out, whosoever is joined to the Chair of Peter, with him shall I be.'" One of the ancient Brehon Laws, and preserved in the *Leabhar Breac*, is given in an Irish tract called, "On Injury and Assault to Ecclesiastics." It proceeds by question and answer and lays down the ancient legislation of the Irish in regard to the respect due to churchmen. In it we read: "Which is the highest dignity on earth? Answer—The dignity of the Church. Which is the highest dignity in the Church? Answer—The dignity of a bishop, and the highest of bishops is the bishop of Peter's Church, to whom the Roman kings are subject."

(1) This Commentary has been attributed to the contemporaneous Claude of Turin: but the internal evidence is in favor of the Irishman, as well as the Cambridge MS., which has the title "*Claudii Scoti Commentarius.*" Such is the opinion of Usher, Ware, Colgan, Harris, and Rothe.

(2) See Moran p. 3, c. 1.

(3) Some confound this writer with St. Cummin Fota, but Colgan, together with the ancient tradition of Ireland, identifies him with Cummin the Fair, abbot of Hy, who died in 669. More modern authors reject the latter theory, Moran thinks, on very slight grounds. This Cummin at one time ruled the monastery of Burrow, but all the scholiasts are silent as to any connection of Cummin Fota with Burrow.

After assigning the respective fines for various injuries to clerics, the tract continues : "Where is this doctrine found ? Answer—It is found in the treatise which Augustine wrote upon the Degrees of the Church, and upon the fines and the reparation to be made ; and it is thus, according to the rule of the Church of Peter, empress of the whole world."

(1). Seventy years before the English invasion of Ireland, Gille-Esperic (Gillebert) was appointed bishop of Lumneach, *anglice*, Limerick. One of his first episcopal acts was to congratulate St. Anselm on having "induced the untamable minds of the Normans to submit to the canons of the holy Fathers" (2). He also addressed a treatise on the "Ecclesiastical State" to all the Irish clergy, from which we take the following : "The picture I have drawn sheweth that all the Church's members are to be brought under one chief bishop, to wit, Christ and His vicar, blessed Peter the Apostle, and the Pope presiding in his See, to be governed by them. . . . . As Noah was placed to rule the ark amidst the waves of the flood, just so does the Roman Pontiff rule the Church amid the billows of this world. . . . The position held in the Eastern church by the patriarchs is that which belongs to archbishops in the West ; and both patriarchs and archbishops are subject in the first degree to the Roman Pontiff. As the patriarchs, however, govern the Apostolic sees, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, it is their privilege to ordain archbishops, and, in a manner, are they likened to the bishop of Rome. To Peter alone, however, was it said : 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.' Therefore, the Pope alone is exalted in dignity above the whole Church, and he alone has the privilege of ordaining and judging all" (3).

That the early Irish church acknowledged the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, is also shown by her canonical enactments. In the ancient *Book of Armagh* (4), is preserved a canon of St. Patrick, in which, after a reservation of certain

(1) Curry MSS. in the Catholic University of Ireland.

(2) This letter was accompanied by a present of twenty-five Irish pearls.

(3) USHER; *Sylloges Epist.*, n. 30.

(4) It is found in "that part of the same old MS. which was copied from the book written by St. Patrick's own hand." Curry's *Lectures*, p. 372; Petrie's *Tara*, p. 81.

cases to the see of Armagh, it is decreed : “ Moreover, if any case of extreme difficulty shall arise, and one which the various judges of the Irish nation cannot decide, let it be referred to the see of the chief bishop of the Irish (that is, of Patrick), and submitted to his episcopal examination. But if such a case of the aforesaid importance cannot easily be decided in that see with the assistance of its wise counsellors, we have decreed that it be sent to the Apostolic See, that is to say, to the Chair of the Apostle Peter, which holds the authority of the city of Rome.” With regard to this canon, which he admits to be genuine (1), Usher patronizingly remarks, “ It is most likely that St. Patrick had a special regard for the Church of Rome, from whence he was sent for the conversion of this island ; so as, if I myself had lived in his days, for the resolution of a doubtful question, I should as willingly have listened to the judgment of the Church of Rome, as to the determination of any church in the whole world ; so reverent an estimation have I of the integrity of that Church as it stood in those days.” However, St. Patrick was not influenced by any mere sentimentalism, or by any individual opinion as to the just-as-good-as-another qualities of the Church of Rome ; nor does he merely express a willingness to submit to a Roman arbitration. He commands that difficult cases be referred to Rome, and because that See is that of Peter. This canon of St. Patrick was obeyed by the Synod of Magh-lene (630), and one of its members, St. Cummian, attests the fact : “ In accordance with the canon, that if serious questions arise, they shall be referred to the head of cities, we sent such as we knew were wise and humble men, to Rome ” (2). About the year 700, a collection of canons for the Irish church was compiled, of which many MSS. have been preserved. The (now) National Library of Paris has one copy of the eighth, and one of the twelfth century ; Darmstadt possesses one of the ninth ; St. Gall another very old ; the Vallicellian Archives at Rome a minuscule MS. of the tenth century : a Cambray MS., of the eighth century, gives us a copy, transcribed by order of bishop Alberic (d. 790) ; and the Cottonian Codex, also of

(1) *Religion of the Ancient Irish*, p. 84.

(2) USHER; *Sylog. Epp.*, n. 30.

the eighth century, used by Usher, Wilkins, Spelman, and others of our opponents, contain it (1). In Can. xx., c. 6, we read: "Care must be taken, that no controversies be referred to other provinces or churches which follow different customs and profess a different religion; or to the Britons, who are contrary to all, and separate themselves from the Roman usages, and from the unity of the Church (2); or to heretics, even when they are affable, and skilled in ecclesiastical causes." And in c. 5, of the same canon, is said: 'St. Patrick enacts: If any grave questions arise in this island, they shall be referred to the Apostolic See. . . . . The Roman canons decree, that when the more difficult questions arise, they are to be referred to the head city. . . . . The Roman Synod enacts: If in any province questions arise which cannot be settled amongst the disputants, let the matters be referred to the chief See.' In the 21st book, entitled, "Method of Inquiry in Causes," the course is prescribed to be followed in matters of doubt, in the very words of Pope Innocent I., "Should the Scriptures not be sufficiently clear, the inquirer must recur to the doctors of the Church;" if he is not then satisfied, "let him consult the canons of the Apostolic See" (3).

That the supremacy of Rome was acknowledged by the early Irish church, is also proved by appeals to the Holy See. Murray, the zealous Protestant dean already quoted, could not impugn the authority of the canons we have just cited, but he confidently asked: "Now, supposing for one moment that this canon and decree were genuine, were they ever acted upon before the twelfth century? The ancient Irish Church on no occasion ever appealed to the bishop of Rome" (4). This author, like nearly all of his brethren, identifies the teaching of his sect with that of the early Irish, and yet he says that Rome, at that time was "the great centre of corrupted Christianity" (5); while the early Irish, as we have seen, proclaim her the centre of the true

(1) Proceedings of R. I. A., Dec. 8th, 1851.

(2) This reference to the obstinacy of the Britons in the Paschal Controversy, shows, of itself, the antiquity of this collection.

(3) The numerous pilgrimages from Ireland to the shrine of Peter, — journeys not undertaken in the spirit of the "sight-seer" — also indicate the belief of the early Irish Christians in the supremacy of the Holy See. See Moran, p. 3, c. 3.

(4) *Ireland and her Church*, p. 29. (5) *Ibid.* p. 59.

faith. Still declaring that Anglicanism and early Irish Catholicism were identical, he asserts that no appeals should be made to Rome, while the early Irish decree that it is to Rome that all difficulties should be carried. He, again like nearly all of his brethren, exults in "the corruptions of the Romish Church" (1), while the early Irish, though they prohibit appeals to heretics, or even to those whose discipline varies from that of Rome, call that See their guide. But let us investigate the accuracy of the assertion that "the ancient Irish on no occasion ever appealed to the bishop of Rome." Towards the close of the sixth century, St. Columbanus and a few companions left their monastery of Bangor, and wended their way to the continent, to gain new conquests for God. The new establishments of Luxieu and Fontaines were soon among the glories of Gaul, but the French clergy became alarmed at the peculiar usages of the Irish monks, and especially at their method of computation of the Easter time. In a Synod held for the purpose, these practices were condemned, but Columbanus, contending that he had received them from his fathers, appealed to Rome, to obtain a reversion of the adverse decree. The appeal, which was made to St. Gregory the Great, did not reach its destination, and Columbanus again addressed "the holy lord and Apostolic father in Christ, the Pope," who was, at that time, Boniface IV., in these words: "To thee alone do we pour out our supplications, through our Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, and through the unity of faith which is common to us, that thou mayest bestow upon us, laboring pilgrims, the solace of thy holy decision, with which thou wilt strengthen the tradition of our elders, if it be not contrary to faith; that thus we may, during our pilgrimage, be enabled, through thy adjudication, to keep the rite of Easter as it was handed down to us by our fathers" (2). Another instance of an appeal to Rome is furnished, in the eighth century, by Ferghil (better known by his Latin name Virgilius), abbot of Archadhb

(1) *Idem*.

(2) Before this appeal could be answered, St. Columbanus had fled from France, owing to the enmity of Brunechild.

(1). Becoming a missionary to the then barbarous Bavarians, he soon was associated with St. Boniface, bishop of Mentz (the English apostle of Germany), and was made bishop of Salzburg by Pope Stephen II. Alcuin composed a poem in his honor, and called him "pious and prudent, second in piety to none;" his German biographers style him "the most learned among the learned." While working with St. Boniface, a controversy on the essential form of the Sacrament of Baptism for a while disturbed their harmony. Some of the clergy, addicted probably to a barbarous pronunciation of the Latin language, were said to have vitiated the form in their utterance, and St. Boniface declared that the sacrament thus administered was invalid. Ferghil, having been educated in the then superior schools of Ireland, seems to have, more precisely than the English bishop, distinguished between the accidentals and the essentials of the sacramental form, and hence he pronounced, in the cases alleged, the baptisms valid. He appealed to the Holy See, and his judgment was confirmed. Still another instance of appeal to Rome, or rather, of being guided by the decisions of Rome, is furnished by the Synod of Magh-lene (630), and the letter of St. Cummian, of which we have spoken in the chapter on the Paschal question. It would be easy to fill volumes with proofs of the devotion and filial obedience of the early Irish church to Rome, but the nature of our work demands that we be content with a few. "To sum up, then, in a few words," to use the language of a learned Irish ecclesiastic (2). "no dissension on religious matters ever arose in Ireland, which was not referred to Rome for adjudication. From Rome Ireland had her precepts of morality and her oracles of faith. Rome was the mother, Ireland the daughter; Rome the head, Ireland the member. From Rome, the fountain-source of religion, Ireland undoubtedly derived, and with her whole soul imbibed, her faith. In doubtful matters, the Pope was the arbiter of the Irish; in things certain, their master; in ecclesiastical matters, their head; in temporals, their defender; in all things, their judge; in

(1) The Four Masters record his death: "In the year 784, Ferghil the geometer, abbot of Archaubho, died in Germany in the 13th year of his episcopate."

(2) Dr. Lynch, archdeacon of Killala, refuting the calumnies of Gerald Barry (Giraldus Cambrensis). Edit. of Celtic Society, 1850, v. 2, p. 635.

everything, their adviser ; their oracle in doubt, their bulwark in the hour of danger. Some hastened to Rome to indulge their fervor at the tomb of the Apostles ; others to lay their homage at the feet of the Pope, and others to obtain the necessary sanction of his authority for the discharge of their functions."

We shall now examine the belief of the early Irish church as to the Holy Eucharist, and will prove that it was that of the Catholic Church of to-day. We shall then notice some of the arguments of our opponents. Among the many monuments of the ancient Irish church, which have come down to us, one of the most valuable is the Stowe Missal (1). In it the words of consecration are given as at present, and the subsequent prayers "agree literally with the Roman Canon down to the Memento for the dead" (2). Thus, we find the Irish of the sixth century using with us of the nineteenth the following beautiful prayer : " Humbly we beseech Thee, O Almighty God, command this offering to be carried by the hands of Thy holy angel unto Thy heavenly altar in the presence of Thy divine Majesty, that all of us who receive, through the participation of this altar, the most holy Body and Blood of Thy Son, may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace, through the same Christ our Lord." In this same Missal, we find the rather un-Protestant " Mass of the Martyrs," " Mass of Virgins," " Mass for the dead." Another valuable monument of early Irish doctrine is the Bobbio Missal already noticed, and bequeathed by St. Columbanus to his Irish disciples in Italy. Here, we read, in the Daily Mass, the prayer : " We give thee thanks, O holy Lord, omnipotent Father, eternal God, who hast satiated us by the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ Thy Son" (3). In the Mass for Lent are commemorated the many blessings imparted by Christ, " by participation of whose Flesh, blessed by Thee, we are strengthened,

(1) The inscriptions, yet remaining on the cover of this Missal, show that it belonged to some church of Munster, and probably to the monastery of Lortha, founded by St. Ruadhan in the sixth century. The original MS. was written in an ancient Lombardic character, " which," says Todd, " may well be deemed older than the sixth century. . . . It is by no means impossible that the MS. may have been the original Missal of St. Ruadhan himself, who died in 584." See *The Ancient Irish Missal*, &c., by James Henthorn Todd, read before R. I. A., June 23d, 1856, and printed from the Transactions of R. I. A. in 1857.

(2) *Ibid*, p. 32.

(3) MABILLON ; *Italian Museum*, v. 1.

and by drinking of whose Blood we are cleansed" (1). The *Antiphonary of Bangor* is certainly of the seventh or eighth century, and it contains a hymn beginning "Come, ye saints," which plainly shows the doctrine of the early Irish church on the Real Presence. We give a literal translation of some of the stanzas (2). "Come, O holy ones, receive the Body of Christ, drinking the Sacred Blood, by which you were redeemed. By the Sacrament of the Body and Blood all are saved from the jaws of hell. In the law it was ordered to immolate victims; these divine Mysteries were prefigured by it. Let all the faithful draw near with pure simplicity; let them receive the Eternal Custodian of their salvation. He gives Heavenly Bread to the hungry; to the thirsty, drink from the living Fountain. The Alpha and Omega, the Lord Christ Himself, now comes, He who is to come to judge mankind" (3). The famous Gaelic scholar, Eugene Curry, describes, in his valuable lectures (4), a Treatise on the Ceremonies of the Mass, contained in the *Leabhar Breac*, deposited in the R. I. Academy. The following literal translation (the original is in both Latin and Gaelic) of one extract, is every pertinent to our thesis: "Another division of that pledge, which has been left to the Church to comfort her, is the Body of Christ and His Blood, which are offered upon the altars of the Christians. The Body, even, which was born of Mary, Immaculate Virgin, without destruction of her virginity, without opening of the womb, without presence of man; and which was crucified by the unbelieving Jews, out of spite and envy, and which arose after three days from death, and sits upon the right hand of God the Father in heaven, in glory

(1) *Ibi*.

(2) A beautiful metrical version, by Denis Florence McCarthy, may be found in Gaffney's *Ancient Irish Church*.

(3) The learned Dr. Todd, at one time ranked in the Usherian school, but afterwards a convert to Catholicism, in his edition of the "Book of Hymns" for the Irish Arch. Society, claims for this hymn a higher antiquity than that of the *Antiphonary* containing it. In the preface to the hymn of St. Sechnall (Secundinus) on St. Patrick, preserved in the *Leabhar Breac*, we read that once, while Sechnall was saying Mass, the apostle arrived to visit him. "When Sechnall had finished the Mass, except taking the Body of Christ, he heard that Patrick had arrived at the place." The preface goes on to say that, leaving the altar, he threw himself at the feet of St. Patrick, and when both were approaching the church, "they heard a choir of angels chanting a hymn. . . . whose beginning is '*Sancti venite, Christi corpus*,' &c., so that from that time to the present, that hymn is chanted in Erin when the Body of Christ is received." This preface, says Todd, is supposed, from its language and style, to be of the 7th or 8th century, and yet it describes the hymn *Sancti venite* as having been sung, from time immemorial, in the churches of Ireland.

(4) *MS. Materials of Irish History*, p. 376.

and in dignity before the angels of heaven ;—it is that Body, the same as it is in this great glory, which the righteous consume off God's Table, that is, the holy Altar. For this Body is the rich Viaticum of the faithful, who journey through the paths of pilgrimage and penitence of this world to the heavenly fatherland. This is the seed of the Resurrection in life eternal to the righteous. It is, however, the origin and cause of falling to the impenitent who believe not, and to the sensual who distinguish it not, though they believe. Woe, then, to the Christian who distinguishes not this Holy Body of the Lord by pure morals, by charity, and by mercy. For it is in this Body that will be found the example of the charity which excels all charity, viz., to sacrifice Himself, without guilt, in satisfaction for the guilt of the whole race of Adam." To this exposition of early Irish faith in the Real Presence, we shall add a few testimonies from the *Penitentials* and other records. The *Penitential* of St. Cummin prescribes penance for those who are guilty of negligence when preserving "the Sacrifice" entrusted to their care (1); the *Bobbio Penitential* (2) assigns a year's penance to him "who shall neglect, or lose, the Eucharist, the Body of the Lord;" both of these passages show a belief in the *permanent* Presence, not a transitory one, in the act of communion. The *Penitential* of St. Columbanus (3), orders that "Special diligence must be used in confessing our sins and imperfections, before the celebration of Mass, lest with an unclean heart we should approach the holy altar. It is better to delay a little, and wait till our heart be free from scandal and envy, than audaciously to approach the judgment-seat; for the altar is the tribunal of Christ, and His Body, present there with His Blood, judges those who unworthily approach." The ancient *Lives* of the early Irish saints are replete with evidence that those heroes held the doctrine of the Real Presence. Thus the *Tripartite Life*, which competent judges assign to the sixth or seventh century (4), represents St. Patrick as saying to Ethne and Fedhemia, daughters of

(1) Chap. 13, n. 5.

(2) Can. 17.

(3) Canon XI., n. 11.

(4) See Curry's *Lectures*, p. 345.

king Leoghaire, "Whilst you are clothed with mortal flesh, you cannot see the Son of God; but to behold Him in the brightness of His majesty, it is necessary to lay aside this corruptible flesh, and first to receive *His Body and Blood, concealed in an invisible manner, beneath the visible form and species of bread and wine.*" Probus (1) says that the ladies replied: "Give us the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, that we may be freed from the corruption of the flesh, and may see our Spouse who is in heaven.' Then St. Patrick celebrated Mass, and both the daughters of the king approached the Communion with great hope and perfect faith." Cogitosus, an Irish writer, assigned by the Protestant Petrie to the commencement of the ninth century (2), gives a description of the convent-church of Kildare, in which the "Mary of Erin," St. Brigid, was wont to worship. To the sanctuary there were two entrances; "The one, through which the bishop, with his clergy and assistants at the altar, entered, *when about to offer up the Sacred Sacrifice of our Lord*; the second door was at the left side of the altar, and through it the abbess alone, with her virgins and faithful widows, entered, *to partake of the banquet of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ*" (3). Adamnan, successor of the great Columbkille in the abbacy of Iona (4), in the seventh century, wrote a *Life* of the holy founder, from which we select, among many equally strong arguments, the following account of a visit made to St. Columbkille by St. Cronan, a bishop of Munster: "Through humility, he sought as much as possible to conceal himself, so that no one might know that he was a bishop. This, however, could not be kept a secret from Columba; for, when on a Sunday he was ordered by St. Columba to consecrate (the text has the stronger term, '*conficere*'), according to custom, the Body of Christ, he called our saint, as a brother priest, to unite with him in breaking the Bread of the Lord. Columba, approaching the altar, looking intuitively into his face, said to him; 'May Christ bless thee, O brother; do thou

(1) *Trias Thaum.*(2) *Round Towers of Ireland*, p. 202.(3) COGITOSUS; *Life of St. Brigid*, c. 35.(4) For many years the monastery of Iona was the main centre of Irish missionary enterprise, and the resort of natives and foreigners who aimed at the acquisition of learning and sanctity. See Montalembert's *Monks of the West*.

follow the episcopal rule, and distribute it alone" (1). In another memoir of St. Columbkille, written by his contemporary, Cumineus Albus (2), we read that the saint having had a vision in which he saw Columbanus, a bishop of Leinster, summoned to judgment, he called his fellow monks, and ordered them to prepare to offer the "Sacred Oblation," saying, "it is my duty to celebrate the Sacred Mysteries of the Eucharist for the holy soul which, during the night, passed to the angelic choirs." Cumineus adds that "whilst he was offering up the Sacred Mysteries of the Holy Sacrifice, he said to the brethren, 'to-day we are to pray for the holy bishop Columbanus.'" St. Fursa, another Irish missionary and saint, patron of Peronne, in France, died in 650. In an ancient *Life* (3), we read that Fursa was promised some supernatural manifestations by an angel, and that he prepared for them "by asking for, and partaking of, the Communion of the Sacred Body and Blood." In the same *Life* are recorded some instructions given to Fursa by two relatives, Sts. Beoan and Mellan, and in one of them is said: "Let the bishops and priests of the Church of Christ stimulate the faithful to tears of repentance for their crimes, and strengthen them with the spiritual food of faith, and by the participation of the Sacred Body and Blood." St. Colgu "the Wise" lived in the eighth century (4), and was the author of many edifying treatises. Among them is a prayer (5) in Irish, "Scuar Chrabhaigh," from which we take the following: "O Holy Jesus! O beautiful Friend! . . . . for the sake of the holy tree upon which Thy side was torn; for the sake of the innocent Blood, which trickled upon us from that tree; for the sake of Thine own Body and Blood which are offered upon all the holy altars which are in all the Christian churches in the world; . . . . dispense, give, and bestow, Thy holy grace and Thy holy Spirit to defend and shelter me," &c. We could proceed indefinitely with sim-

(1) The phrase *Christi Corpus conficere* is of frequent recurrence in liturgical treatises.

(2) In Mabillon's *Acta SS. Bened.*, v. 1.

(3) Usher judges that it was composed before the time of Bede (b. 672). See *Religion of the Ancient Irish*, p. 37.

(4) He was attached to the monastic school of Clonmacnoise. In a letter published in Usher's *Sylloge*, Alcuin styles him "his blessed master and pious father."

(5) Curry's MS.; *Lectures*, p. 379; Colgan's *Act. SS.*, p. 378.

ilar citations, but enough has been given to indicate the mind of the early Irish church as to the meaning of the Holy Eucharist. We shall now devote a few moments to the arguments of our adversaries.

Usher, one of the most respectable, and certainly the most learned, of those Protestants who try to identify the Anglican establishment with the early Irish church, appeals to the poet Sedulius, Claude, and a few other Irish writers, to sustain his theory. Let us see what comfort he can derive from Sedulius (1). This poet bore the fame of Ireland to the continent in the fifth century, and by his *Carmen Paschale* and its corresponding *Paschal Prose*, won for himself a great reputation. Usher asserts that this author affirms that only bread and wine are offered to God in the Eucharist, and in proof, he adduces a passage from the Poem, and one from the Prose. The first reads: "Who else presides as chief-pontiff and high priest but Christ, institutor of the two-fold libation, of the order of Melchisedech, to whom his own gifts, the fruit of the corn, and the joy of the vine, are always offered?" (2) The second, which Usher cites as rendering more clear the meaning of the former, styles the Eucharist "The sweet meat of the seed of wheat, and the lovely drink of the pleasant vine" (3). In formulating this objection, the Protestant primate of Ireland deliberately mutilated the text of Sedulius, by cutting out from the second passage words which are certainly too eloquent of Catholicism for Protestant taste. The immediate context reads: "For who but the Lord is present, the Pontiff of pontiffs, the Priest of priests, the Author and Founder of the two-fold libation, whose gifts, according to the order of Melchisedech, *which He offered for us upon the cross, changed into His own Flesh*, are the sweet meat of the seed of wheat, and the lovely drink of the pleasant vine" (4). After noting the dishonesty of Usher, which is but too usual with gentry of his school, no comment is necessary, on our part, to elicit

(1) Pope Gelasius calls him "the venerable Sedulius," and commends his works to the faithful. Venantius Fortunatus also eulogizes him, while St. Hildephonse styles him "an evangelical poet, an eloquent orator, and a Catholic writer;"—a curious fact, if, as Usher asserts, Sedulius was a Sacramentarian.

(2) *Paschal Poem*, b. 4, v. 206.

(3) *Paschal Prose*, *idem*.

(4) *Poem* b. 5, v. 289.

the thorough Catholicity of the quoted passages of Sedulius. But the reader will please observe how plainly the poet presents the Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist in the following passages : "All of us who, under Christ our leader, are regenerated in the fountain of waters, taking His Body and Blood, do eat and drink thereof that we may deserve to enjoy the Holy Ghost." Another Sedulius, an Irish commentator of the ninth century, is also cited by the Anglican primate, but, if the reader will carefully weigh the quoted words, he will find that the learned abbot, so far from broaching Protestant ideas, taught simple Catholic doctrine. In a Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, we read : "Melchisedech offered bread and wine to Abraham for a figure of Christ, offering His Body and Blood unto the Father upon the cross." And in another place of the same Commentary, "But we offer daily for a commemoration of the Lord's passion, once endured, and for our own salvation." Certainly, all Catholics recognize in the Holy Sacrifice a commemoration of Christ's passion, and only Catholics rejoice, with Sedulius, that it is everywhere daily offered for our salvation. Usher tells us that "elsewhere, expounding the words of our Saviour, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' he brings in the similitude used before him and after him by others, 'He left us a memorial of Himself, even as if one that was going on a far journey, should leave some token of affection with a loved companion ; that as often as he beholds it, he may call to mind his benefits and friendship.'" To this we reply that not only Sedulius uses this phrase ; it is used even by the Catholic Church (1). But in quoting this phrase, the Anglican publicist is again guilty of a trick which is but too common with our adversaries. He omits the preceding words : "Take and eat ; this is my Body. As if St. Paul said : beware not to eat that Body unworthily, for it is the Body of Christ." With these words, the passage of Sedulius becomes emphatically Catholic. Usher appeals also to Claudius as favorable to the Protestant theory, but to attain a semblance of success in the estimation of his credulous readers, he has recourse again to misre-

(1) Mass and Office of the Blessed Sacrament.

presentation. The following passage is cited as favorable to the Protestant tenets: "Our Saviour wished first to deliver to His disciples the Sacrament of His Body and Blood, which he presented in the breaking of the Body (1) and the effusion of the Chalice; and afterwards to immolate the Body itself upon the altar of the cross." No ordinary ingenuity could so manipulate these words as to cause them to evince the Protestant notion of the Eucharist, yet Usher tells us that herein, "Claudius expressly distinguishes the Sacrament of the Body, which was delivered unto the disciples, from the Body itself, which was afterwards offered upon the cross." He certainly does, and so do all Catholics; but nevertheless, while Protestants say that the Eucharist is mere bread and wine, Claudius says that it is the Body and Blood of Christ. Usher professes to inquire into the belief of Claudius as to the nature of the Eucharist, and yet he says nothing of the very chapters in which our author expressly treats of it. From them we select the following passages: "Whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to His disciples, saying, 'Take and eat; This is my Body.' The ceremonies of the ancient Passover being at an end, He passes to the New Pasch, which he wished the Church to observe as a memorial of her redemption; thus, forsooth, instead of the flesh and blood of the lamb, *substituting the Sacrament of His own Flesh and Blood*, and showing Himself to be Him of whom it was written: 'The Lord hath sworn, nor shall he repent: Thou art a priest forever, according to the order of Melchisedech.'" When speaking of our Lord's burial in the tomb, Claudius remarks: "We may, in a spiritual sense, learn from these words, that the Body of the Lord is not to be placed upon gold, gems, or silk, but upon plain linen. . . . hence is derived the custom of the Church, to offer the Sacrifice of the altar not upon cloths of silk or of rich dye, but only upon simple linen cloths, according to the decree of the blessed Pope Sylvester." Finally, in his Com-

(1) Usher, strange to say, is candid enough to draw attention to the significant phrase "the breaking of the Body," saying: "At first sight I did verily think that in these words an error had been committed in my transcript, *Body* being miswritten for *bread*; but, afterwards, comparing it with the original, I found that the author retained that manner of speaking." The Vatican text (*Codex Vat.*, 3828, fol. 119) confirms this reading.

mentary on Leviticus, Claudius gives a beautiful passage which Usher has himself edited (1), but carefully avoided in the present question: "On the cross Christ rendered His Flesh eatable for us. For had He not been crucified, the Sacrifice of His Body would not be eaten; but now it is eaten in memory of the Lord's passion. Anticipating the cross, He immolated Himself at the supper with the Apostles—He who, bearing the scars of His sufferings, after His resurrection, introduced His Blood into the tabernacle of heaven." Thus, according to Claudius, the Flesh of Christ is indeed our food. The Redeemer offered, at the last supper, a true Sacrifice to His Father; anticipating, in a sense, the Sacrifice of the cross. And further, declares Claudius, this mysterious Sacrifice must be referred to the same mystery and power by which Christ bore His wounds into glory. There are some other writers of minor importance (2), cited by Usher, but our limits compel us to conclude this paragraph with a notice of an objection founded upon some supposed sayings of the celebrated Scotus Erigena (3). Usher asserts that Scotus Erigena was the author of a tract entitled "The Body and Blood of the Lord," condemned by the Synod of Vercelli in 1049, but the able editor of his works, Henry Joseph Floss (1853), having searched the archives of Europe, came to the conclusion that the treatise condemned at Vercelli was the work, not of the Irish writer, but of Ratramn or Bertram, a monk of Corbie, an author of whom we shall take occasion to speak when treating of the religious belief of the early Anglo-Saxon church. Berengarius, the Sacramentarian

(1) *Sylog. Epp.*, No. 20.

(2) Among these is the Transcript of the Gospels, with an interlinear commentary made by an Irish scribe called Maelbrihte. The first to allege this MS. in support of Protestantism was John O'Toolan of Derry (better known by the name Toland, which he assumed after he had renounced faith, family, and country) an apostate of the last century. Dr. Moran, in his Essay on the Eucharistic doctrine of the Irish Church, gives an admirable refutation of O'Toolan's arguments.

(3) John Scotus Erigena, not to be confounded with the great Franciscan doctor, John Duns Scotus, born at Dunstone in England, was an Irish writer of the ninth century, who made quite a stir during the reign of Charles the Bald. It is the fashion with Protestants to style him a learned, solid, and brilliant theologian, and an eminent philosopher. Thus Mosheim, *Hist.*, 9th Cent., p. 2, c. 1, and *passim* bestows upon him eulogies which he gives to no Father of the Church; and this simply because he is supposed to have attacked the Catholic faith in the Real Presence. As to the truth of this accusation, we can only judge by the opinion of his contemporaries, for none of his Eucharistic writings have reached us. According to his contemporaries Erigena was a subtle and daring sophist, with much profane erudition, but with but little knowledge of Scripture or tradition; infected with Pelagianism and Origenism, and even with the impieties of the Collyridians (Arabian heretics of the first centuries, who paid divine honors to the Blessed Virgin).

leader of the eleventh century, certainly attributed the tract to Erigena, but, in the absence of corroborating proof of its authenticity, we may well suppose that the French heretic fraudulently procured the protection of a great name. We know that the Irish author was requested by the French clergy to oppose the teachings of Paschasius Radbertus, and that the whole controversy then in agitation was not in regard to the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, but about the manner in which it was affected ; about, also, not the fact of Christ's Body being present, but whether or not identity could be asserted of the natural and the Sacramental Body. It is exceedingly improbable that Erigena would have remained in favor at the French court, or that Anastasius the Librarian would have eulogized him, had he rejected Catholic doctrine. His contemporaries accuse him of Semipelagianism and Pantheism, and in such of his works as have reached us, some obscure passages seem to give color to the imputation. But, on the other hand, Berengarius and his disciples are accused of corrupting and distorting the sayings of Erigena—an old dodge of heretics, and one continued in more modern times, as we have noticed in the case of the Anglican primate of Armagh. At any rate, Usher can produce no authenticated saying of John Scotus Erigena, which militates against the doctrine of Transubstantiation. At best, he can only cite the condemnation by a Catholic Synod of a tract on the Blessed Sacrament, imputed to this author, and conclude that this condemnation is *prima facie* evidence that he taught what is now Protestant doctrine—a conclusion which is entirely too sweeping, and not logically proceeding from the premises.

Of the few points of doctrine in which all Protestant sects agree, one is that veneration of the saints, and the practice of asking their prayers, should be rejected. It will be interesting to note the teaching of the early Irish church on this subject. Preserved in the *Leabhar Breac*, which the Protestant Petrie (1) calls "the oldest and best MS. relating to Church history now preserved (in Ireland), or which, perhaps, the Irish ever possessed," is an ancient Litany of

(1) *Hist. and Antiq. of Tara*, published from the Transactions of the R. I. A., 1839.

the Blessed Virgin, which Curry pronounces "as old, at least, as the middle of the 8th century." From among sixty titles which Protestants would deem extravagant, we select the following: "O Great Mary, Greatest of Women, Queen of Angels, Mistress of the Heavens, Mother of the Heavenly and Earthly Church, Gate of Heaven, Cleansing of Sin, Star of the Sea, Mother of Christ, Destruction of Eve's Disgrace, Sanctuary of the Holy Spirit, Queen of Life." And among the prayers attached to this Litany, are the following: "Let our devotion and our sighs be carried through thee to the presence of the Creator, for we are not ourselves worthy of being heard, because of our evil deserts. O Powerful Mistress of Heaven and Earth, dissolve our trespasses and our sins; destroy our wickedness and our corruptions; raise the fallen, the debilitated, and the fettered; loose the condemned; repair through thyself the transgressions of our immoralities and our vices; bestow upon us through thyself the blossoms and ornaments of good actions and virtues; appease for us the Judge by thy voice and thy supplications; allow us not to be carried off from thee among the spoils of our enemies; allow not our souls to be condemned, but take us to thyself forever, under thy protection" (1). In the Bobbio Missal there is a Mass in honor of Mary for her general feasts, and another for the Assumption. In the former, we read the following prayer: "Hear us, O Lord, Holy Father, All-powerful God, who by the overshadowing of the womb of Blessed Mary, didst deign to illumine the whole world; we suppliantly pray Thy Majesty that what we cannot acquire by our merits, we may obtain through her protection. We beseech Thee, too, O Lord, that the joys of Blessed Mary may accompany us, and by her merits may the handwriting of our sin be cancelled." In the latter Mass, the soul of Mary is said to be "wreathed with various crowns; the Apostles render sacred homage to her, the angels intone their canticles, Christ embraces her, the clouds are her chariot, paradise her house, where, decked with glory, she reigns amid the virgin-choirs."

(1) This old Irish Litany was so pleasing to our late beloved Pontiff, Pius IX., that he attached an indulgence of 100 days to its recitation.

The Canon of this Mass also gives the usual commemoration: "Venerating, in the first place, the memory of the ever-virgin Mary, Mother of our Lord and God, Jesus Christ." The devotion of the early Irish to St. Brigid also illustrates their love and veneration for Mary. St. Brigid, or Bridget, is called the wonder of womankind, but the climax of praise is reached when they say that she is "like unto the Mother of God." What Mary is for the whole Church, Bridget seems to be for Ireland; in fine, the latter is "the Mary of the Irish," as many of the olden records explicitly style her. The Litany of St. Ængus, admitted by all Irish scholars to be a composition of the eighth century, begins: "The three times fifty Roman pilgrims who settled in Ui-Mele; I invoke to my aid through Jesus Christ. The three thousand father confessors who met in Munster to consider one question; I invoke, &c. The other thrice fifty pilgrims of the men of Rome and Latium, who went into Scotland; I invoke, &c. The thrice fifty Gaedhils of Erin in holy orders, each of them a man of strict rule, who went in one body into pilgrimage, under Abban, the son of Ua-Cormaic, I invoke, &c." The mind of the early Irish church on this point is also shown by the ancient *Book of Kells*, of which the learned Protestant Westwood, an undoubted judge of Irish MSS., says (1): "Ireland may justly be proud of the *Book of Kells*. This copy of the Gospels, traditionally asserted to have belonged to St. Columba, is unquestionably the most elaborately executed manuscript of early art now in existence; far excelling, in the gigantic size of the letters in the frontispieces of the Gospel, the excessive minuteness of the ornamental details, the number of its decorations the fineness of the writing, and the endless variety of initial capital letters, with which every page is ornamented, the famous Gospel of Lindisfarne (2) in the Cottonian Library. . . . The verso of fol. 7, contains the drawing of the Virgin and Child, copied in plate 1, which is inclosed within a highly elaborate border composed of interlined lacertine animals with dogs' heads. This singular composi-

(1) *Sacred Palæography*.

(2) The monastery of Lindisfarne was founded by Irish monks from Iona.

tion is interesting from the proof it affords of the veneration of the Virgin Mary in the early Irish church; the large size in which she is represented, as well as the 'glory' around her head (which singularly bears three small crosses), evidently indicating the high respect with which the Mother of Christ was regarded." In the *Antiphonary of Bangor*, a MS. of the eighth century, is contained a hymn, written, we are distinctly told, by Sechnall, "a nephew of St. Patrick." In it we read the prayer: "Patrick, bishop, pray for all of us, that our sins may be completely wiped away."

That auricular confession was practised among the early Irish, is not denied by any author of note. Usher admits that "they did, no doubt, both publicly and privately, make confession of their faults, as well that they might receive counsel and direction, as that they might be made partakers of the *benefit of the keys* . . . . Sure we are that this was the practice of the ancient Scottish and Irish" (1). We therefore pass to another distinctively Catholic doctrine, that of Purgatory and prayers for the dead, in order to see whether, on this matter at least, the early Irish Christians agreed with our separated brethren. We have already alluded to the Bobbio Missal. In this monument of the early Irish church, certainly of the sixth century, and probably used by St. Columbanus himself, there are various prayers to God, "for the pardon of the deceased," and for the remission of their sins. Thus, in a "Mass for the Dead," we read: "Grant, O Lord, to Thy deceased servant the pardon of his sins, in that secret receptacle where there is no opportunity of doing penance. And do Thou, O Christ, receive the soul of Thy servant, and pardon his offences more fully than he forgave those who offended him." And in a "Mass for Living and Dead," we read: "Mercifully grant that this Sacred Oblation may procure pardon for the dead, and may promote the salvation of the living." But what better proof of this practice of praying for the dead can be asked than that furnished by the tombs of the dead? About sixty years ago,

(1) *Religion of the Ancient Irish*, c. 6.

we learn from the Protestant Petrie (1), was discovered the tomb of St. Breccan, founder of the monastery of Ardbraccan, Meath, in the sixth century. He had retired to the island of Arran, and was there interred, in a church of his foundation. Within the sepulchre was found a small block of limestone; on it was carved a cross, and the inscription: "A prayer for Breccan the pilgrim." At Monasterboice, near Drogheda, are three large Irish crosses, of which Wilde says: "they have been not only the great boast of Irish antiquaries, but have frequently, and in glowing terms, elicited the admiration of foreigners. With the exception of the great cross at Clonmacnoise, and one which we ourselves recently exhumed near the cathedral of St. Breccan in the great island of Arran, there is nothing of the kind in Great Britain, or perhaps in Europe, either in magnitude, design, or execution, to compare with two at least of the crosses at Monasterboice . . . . . the various compartments contain figures of the Apostles, the Virgin and Child, and some of our Irish saints . . . . . inferior in point of size, but eminently superior in artistic design and execution, is the second crucial monument, which we know, from an Irish inscription on its base, was erected by Abbot Muiredach—'A prayer for Muiredach, by whom this cross was made.'" As there were only two abbots of this name, one of whom died in 844, and the other in 924, the cross must be the work of the ninth or tenth century (2). In the year 924, died Colman, abbot of Clonmacnoise, the great monastery founded by St. Kieran in 547 (3). He erected the cross alluded to in the previous quotation. Its only inscription, unlike the fulsome eulogies of modern times, is "A prayer for Colman, who made this cross on the King Flann. A prayer for Flann, son of Maelsechlain." The cross of Tuam, erected in the beginning of the twelfth century, bears this inscription: "A prayer for Turlock O'Connor, for the Abbot of Jarlath, by whom was made this cross. A prayer for O'Ossin, for the Abbot by whom it was made. A prayer for the successor of Jarlath, for Aed

(1) *Round Towers*; *Transactions of Royal Irish Academy*, v. 20, p. 138.

(2) See *Ancient Irish Church*, by Rev. James Gaffney, Dublin, 1863.

(3) *FOUR MASTERS*; v. 1.

O'Ossin, by whom was made this cross." These testimonies were not sufficiently conclusive for Usher. Like Bingham in the case of the early Saxon church (1), he discovered that the early Irish did not offer prayers as a propitiation for the dead, but as a thanksgiving for the happiness which they believed to be already the lot of the dead. "Neither the commemoration," says he (2), nor the praying for the dead, nor the Requiem Masses, has any necessary relation to Purgatory, because they are merely thanksgiving." But we have seen, *e. g.*, in the Bobbio Missal, prayers to God "for the pardon of the deceased," and Usher exposes his own bad faith by quoting the following: "Magnus said, on his death-bed, to his friend Tozzo, bishop of Ausboro, 'Do not weep because thou beholdest me laboring in so many storms of worldly troubles, because I believe in the mercy of God that my soul shall rejoice in the freedom of immortality; yet I beseech thee, that thou *will not cease* to help me, a sinner, and my soul, with thy holy prayers.'" (3)

On Feb. 20th, 1857, the Irish Justice Keogh delivered the following opinion: "It was not, as some vulgarly suppose, a fact that priests in the Roman Catholic Church were never allowed to marry—that celibacy was always enjoined in the Church. It was a fact that, down to a late period, priests and bishops in the Roman Catholic Church were allowed to marry, and did marry. To the year 1015, priests were allowed to marry, and the vow of celibacy was not required until the year 1076" (4). If the reader is disposed to doubt the historical accuracy of Mr. Justice Keogh, he must know that the great English lawyer, Lord Coke, in his chapter on Ireland, in the 4th Institute, informs us that in a "synod holden in Ireland by St. Patrick, their apostle, it was unanimously agreed that Irish priests should have wives" (5). When we come to treat of the celibacy of the clergy, it will be seen that Mr. Keogh's knowledge of ecclesiastical history is greatly at fault, and that, whatever Coke

(1) See our chapter on Conversion of England.

(2) *Religion of Ancient Irish*, p. 28.

(3) *Ibid.*

(4) Case of Beamish *vs.* Beamish.

(5) Whiteside, M. P., quoted by Gaffney, *loc. cit.*

may have known of English law, his proficiency in Irish church history was no greater than that of the Irish judge. But even though it were shown that the early Irish church tolerated a married clergy, as some of the churches in communion with Rome still do, and always have done, modern Protestants could not claim that Irish church as their own. Clerical celibacy is a matter of discipline, and not of faith. With regard to the discipline of the early Irish in this matter, a learned Protestant writer (1) says: "The idea of the necessity or paramount importance of celibacy, as a rule for the clergy, prevailed at a very early period in most parts of the church, and although 'from the beginning it was not so,' yet few instances of the contrary can be cited from our ancient writers; so that the general practice of our forefathers in this matter would appear to have been pretty much in accordance with the law which was afterwards introduced." In another place (2), the same author says: "We would guard our readers against errors, and not lead them to suppose that the Irish Christians of the seventh century agreed more nearly with ourselves than they really did, according to the accounts given of them in ancient histories. There are points connected with Columbanus—such, for instance, as his views concerning vows and monastic celibacy,—which mark a clear distinction between his system and our own." We shall say nothing about the Irish monastic rule in reference to celibacy, for no one denies that, in all ages and in all countries, strict continency was enjoined upon monks and nuns. But we propose to show that, in the early Irish church, the secular clergy were not allowed to marry. In the Bobbio Missal, the following canon is sufficiently explicit: "If any cleric of the higher grade, who has had a wife, should, after his elevation, live with her again, let him know that he commits adultery." Certainly if one, married before his priesthood, was obliged to leave his wife, one already ordained could not marry. There is extant a treatise by St. Columbanus on the "Measure of Penances," in which the 20th clause reads: "If any cleric or deacon, or one in any orders, who

(1) REV. B. KING; *Church History*, v. 1, p. 370.(2) *Ibi*, p. 316.

has been a layman in the world with sons and daughters, should, after giving himself to God, again live with his wife and beget a son of her, let him know that he has committed adultery, and has fallen into as great a sin as though he had been a cleric from his youth, and had communicated with a girl to whom he was not married; because he has offended *after his vow*, and after his consecration to God and he has made void his vow. Therefore, for seven years he shall do penance on bread and water." In the *Penitential* of Cumminian there is a canon as follows: "If any cleric or monk, after having vowed himself to God, should secularize himself, or should take a wife, let him do penance for ten years, three of them on bread and water, and let him never again know the woman. If he disobeys, a Synod or the Apostolic See will separate him from the communion and association of Catholics." In the year 1186, a Synod was held in Dublin, and the following canon was enacted, in consequence of the iniquities of some of the Anglo-Norman clergy in the train of the invaders: "Since the clergy of Ireland, among other virtues, have been always remarkably eminent for their chastity, and it would be ignominious if they should be corrupted through his (the archbishop's) negligence, by the foul contagion of strangers, and the example of a few incontinent men, he therefore forbids, under the penalty of losing both office and benefice, any priest, deacon, or subdeacon, to keep any woman in his house, under the pretence of necessary services, or for any other reason whatsoever, unless a mother, own sister, or a person whose age would remove all suspicion of any unlawful intercourse." It is remarkable that Gerald Barry (*Cambrensis*), an English priest, who was present at this Synod, and who wielded one of the most slanderous pens that ever wrote against Ireland, when treating of the Irish clergy, said: "The clergy of this country are very commendable for religion, and among the many virtues which distinguish them, their prerogative of chastity is pre-eminent." These testimonies are certainly sufficient to show that the early Irish church held views upon clerical continence, very different from those of Protestants. It would

be interesting to compare the practice of this church with that of the reformed sects, in regard to the use of the sign of the cross; to note the sharp contrast between the former's devout belief in the perpetuation of miraculous powers in the Church, and the latter gentry's quiet consent as to the utter cessation of such gifts since the days of the Apostles. But enough has been said to prove the utter Romanism of the early Irish Christians.

In the course of this chapter, we frequently have had occasion to refer to the celebrated monastery founded by St. Columbanus, at Bobbio in Italy. After this saint had founded many seminaries of sanctity and learning in France and Germany, he went, in the beginning of the seventh century, into Italy, with the design of fixing there his permanent abode. His native island owed her first apostles to Italy, and now, when the peninsula had fallen upon evil times, she was destined to receive some comfort from the children of Erin. It was an epoch of wars and of every kind of tumult, hence the lover of prayer and of study established his new monastery in the solitudes of northern Liguria, at the head of the valley of the Trebbia. In this quiet retreat, Columbanus and his followers helped to stem the tide of barbarism, and prepared for future ages a large number of literary treasures. By the labor of their hands these monks procured their food, and turned their Alpine desert into a fruitful region. In a few years after the death of their holy founder (615), the monks of Bobbio numbered a hundred and forty; crowds of people clustered around the sanctuary for protection and comfort, and by the year 1014, the little settlement had become an episcopal city (1). St. Columbanus brought to his Italian home a number of codices which became the nucleus of a famous library; among the books which formerly belonged to it are many Saxon and Gaelic MSS. of the 6th and 7th centuries. For several centuries the monks were occupied in transcribing codices, and whenever one of their number went to Rome, he returned with an assortment of good books. When the many benefactors of the monastery wished to make it a spec-

(1) UGHELLI; *Sacred Italy*, IV., 926. ROSSETTI; *Bobbio Illustrated*.

ially valuable present, rare codices were sure to be chosen. Among such benefactors, the names of Dungal, Smaragdus, and Agilulph are eminent, and they are found written on many of the old MSS. By the tenth century the library of Bobbio had become one of the largest in Europe. "To form an idea," says the learned Barnabite, Vercellone (1), "of the literary wealth of the monastery of Bobbio, it is enough to know that, during the last three centuries, no other library has furnished more abundant material to the researches of scholars; no other has preserved so many texts of ancient classics, sacred and profane. And to speak only of our own time, codices coming from Bobbio have given us the *Republic* of Cicero, and additional fragments of his *Orations*; Marcus Aurelius, Symmachus, the Ante-Justinian Code, the codex of Theodosius, the Sermons of St. Augustine, fragments of the version of Ulfila, the apocryphal books of the Old Testament (2), and many other very precious works which had, for a long time, been sought for in vain. This library alone, nay, merely the relics of this one library, have given their most precious codices to the most celebrated of modern libraries, the Vatican, the Ambrosian, those of Turin, Naples, and Vienna. This one fact will enable you to judge of what the library of Bobbio must have been, in its palmy days. These immense literary riches, accumulated by the monks during three centuries, were afterwards guarded during the dark ages in a manner, rather unique than rare. If I were asked the reason of this singular fact, I could only give one based on the condition of the locality. It is, so to say, isolated from the rest of Italy, being almost buried in the mountains, . . . . . Again, there was not, or we do not know that there was, anything in the monastery likely to excite the cupidity of the barbarians who often devastated, from one end to the other, our too beautiful peninsula. Hence, while ignorance and barbarism scattered or destroyed all the other libraries of the world, that of Bobbio remained hidden and almost forgotten, and was enabled,

(1) Discourse on a certain Bobbio Palimpsest, read in the Pontifical Tiberine Academy, Rome, April 22, 1841, and printed in the *Arcadian Journal*, new series, vol. 23; *Academic Dissertations*, Rome, 1864.

(2) See MAI: *New Library of the Fathers*, v. 1, p. XIX.; CERIANI: *Sacred and Profane Monuments*, Milan, 1861.

to our great profit, to preserve the incomparable treasures of ancient wisdom which the wise industry of the monks had deposited there." Bobbio is certainly one of the glories of Italy, and it was long after the time of Columbanus and his Irish brethren that it attained its greatest fame. But still it was Irish zeal for the faith preached by St. Patrick that laid the foundation of that fame. "From the moment that this green Erin," says Montalembert (1), "situated at the extremity of the known world, had seen the sun of faith rise upon her, she had vowed herself to it with an ardent and tender devotion, which became her very life. The course of ages has not interrupted this; the most bloody and implacable of persecutions has not shaken it; the defection of all northern Europe has not led her astray; and she maintains still, amid the splendor and miseries of modern civilization and Anglo-Saxon supremacy, an inexhaustible centre of faith, where survives, along with the completest orthodoxy, that admirable purity of manners which no conqueror and no adversary has ever been able to dispute, to equal, or to diminish. The ecclesiastical antiquity and hagiography of Ireland constitute an entire world of inquiry. The productiveness of the monastic germ planted by Patrick and Bridget was prodigious; for shortly the monasteries of Bangor, Clonfert, and elsewhere, became entire towns, each of which enclosed more than three thousand cenobites. There was, besides, an intellectual development which the hermits of Egypt had not known. The Irish communities, joined by the monks from Gaul and Rome, whom the example of Patrick had drawn upon his steps, entered into rivalry with the great monastic schools of Gaul. They explained Ovid there; they copied Virgil; they devoted themselves especially to Greek literature; they drew back from no inquiry—from no discussion; they gloried in placing boldness upon a level with faith. A characteristic still more distinctive of the Irish monks, as of all their nation, was the imperious necessity of spreading themselves without, of seeking or carrying knowledge and faith afar, and of penetrating into the most distant regions

(1) *Monks of the West*, v. 2, p. 389.

to watch or combat Paganism ; this monastic nation, therefore, became the missionary nation, by excellence. While some came to Ireland to procure religious instruction, the Irish missionaries launched forth from their island ; they covered the land and seas of the west. Unwearied navigators, they landed on the most desert islands ; they overflowed the continent with their successive emigrations ; they saw in incessant visions a world known and unknown to be conquered for Christ." St. Bernard tells us that "From Ireland, as from an overflowing stream, crowds of holy men descended on foreign nations." St. Rupert, who had been baptized by a nephew of St. Patrick, went, with twelve companions, to evangelize Bavaria. St. Columba and twelve more (1) undertook the apostolic mission to Albany. St. Eloquius carried the faith into Belgium ; St. Willibrod into Germany ; St. Ailbe into Iceland ; St. Seizen into Armoric Britain ; Sts. Florentius, Argobastus, and Hidulf, into Alsace. In Lynch's excellent refutation of Gerald Barry, entitled *Cambrensis Eversus*, is given a long list of Irish saints "who toiled in strange lands, and fortified them abundantly with the dew of their faith and virtues." In Italy, were Donatus at Fiesole ; and Andrew and Bridget, at Opaca. In Picardy, Sts. Caidoc and Fricorius. At Rheims, Sts. Gibrian, Tressan, Hoelan, Abram, German, Veran, Petroan, Promptia, Possenna, and Iruda. At Paris, Claude, Clement, and John. At Boulogne, Vulgan, Kilian, and Obod. In the district of Beauvais, Maura, Brigid, and Hyspad. In Kleggon, Germany, Northberga and Sista. At Ratisbon, Sts. Marian, John, Candidus, Clement, Murcherdach, and Magnoald. In Austrasia, Sts. Kilian, Colonatus and Totnan. "Not taking into account," says Lynch, "those who were canonized in Britain, nor those who went over to the continent in large bodies, we have in Italy, St. Cathaldus, patron of Tarentum ; St. Donatus, patron of Fiesole ; St. Emilian, patron of Faventum, and St. Frigidian, of Lucca. Pavia honors John Albinus as the founder of her university, and St. Cumean is, above all other saints, the favorite patron of Bobbio. In

(1) Nearly all of the Irish chiefs of missions were accompanied by twelve assistants, probably in memory of our Lord's chosen Apostles, and perhaps, also, in honor of the twelve sent by Rome with Palladius to Ireland.

Gaul, St. Mansuetus is patron of Tulle; St. Finlag, patron of Metz; and St. Præcordius, of Corbie. Amiens honors St. Forcensius, and Poitiers, St. Fridolin. St. Elias is patron of Angouleme, St. Anatolius of Besançon, St. Fiacre of Meaux, St. Fursa of Peronne, and St. Lawrence of Eu. Liege honors Momo, and Strasbourg Sts. Florentius and Arbogast. In Brittany, Sts. Origin, Toava, Tenan, Gildas, Brioc, and many others, are revered as patrons. . . . . In Belgium, you have in Brabant, Sts. Rumold, Fredegand, Himelin, Dymrna, and Gerebern; in Flanders, Sts. Levin, Guthagon, Columbanus; in Artois, Sts. Liugluio, Liuglianus, Kilian, Vulgan, Fursa, and Obod; in Hainaut, Sts. Ette, Adalgisus, Abel, Wasnulf, and Mombolus; in Namur, Sts. Farennan and Eloquius; in Liege, Sts. Ultan, Foillan, and Bertuin; in Guel-dres, Sts. Wiro, Plechelm, and Othger; in Friesland, Sts. Suitbert and Acca. But Germany especially was the most flourishing vineyard of our saints. St. Albuin, or Witta, is honored as apostle in Thuringia; St. Disibode, at Treves; St. Erhard, in Alsace and Bavaria; St. Fridolin, in the Grisons of Switzerland; St. Gall among the Suabians, Swiss, and Rhætians; St. John in Mecklenburg; St. Virgil at Salzburg; St. Kilian, in Franconia; St. Rupert, in part of Bavaria. . . . . Was ever panegyric more appropriate than the words of Eric of Auxerre? ‘Need I mention Ireland, who, despising the dangers of the deep, emigrates to our shores, with almost the whole host of her philosophers; the greatest among them become voluntary exiles to minister to the tastes of our wisest Solomon?’ Now, we would ask of those who contend that the faith of the early Irish church was not that of Rome, what kind of doctrine did these Irish apostles preach to their neophytes? What doctrine was believed, what system practiced, by these many Irish saints so revered on the continent of Europe? They everywhere founded churches, or at least worshipped in churches, which acknowledged the supremacy of Rome. Our adversaries must therefore suppose, either that all these evangelizers and saints at once apostatized to Rome, immediately upon commencing their mission; or that none of these countries which revere these saints, held the faith of Rome,

when they commenced to honor them. Either idea is as absurd as it is historically false. Viewing, then, the close alliance which subsisted between the continental churches, which confessedly acknowledged the supremacy of the Holy See, and the representatives of the early Irish church, we must conclude that this latter church professed obedience to the Chair of St. Peter, and devoutly received the doctrine that it taught.

---

## CHAPTER XXVIII.

### EUTYCHIANISM, AND THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.

Eutyches was a monk, as most heresiarchs have been, in illustration of the motto "*corruptio optimi pessima.*" His position as Archimandrite of the most famous monastery of Constantinople, gave him considerable influence, and at first he used it well in the cause of truth, being most ardent in combatting the heresy of Nestorius. But his zeal lacked the foundation of theological knowledge, and hence he easily fell into an error which was simply the extreme opposite of the one he attacked. St. Leo, in a letter to Pulcheria, says that his heresy "was born rather of ignorance than of subtlety," and in his *epist.* 19, he styles him "an unlearned defender of the ancient faith." He presented the two Natures as coalesced into one in the Person of Christ; asserting that our Lord was *of* or *from* two Natures, but not *in* two Natures. According to him, the two Natures, which subsisted before the union, became one after it, and hence came the corollary that Christ was not of our substance in the flesh. This error soon spread beyond the monastery, and by the year 448 it had become pretty well known. An intimate friend of Eutyches, Eusebius of Dorylaeum, tried in vain to correct the theologaster, and finally laid the matter before Flavian, bishop of Constantinople. This prelate was at that time (449) holding a Synod of his suffragans, and when the bishops heard the complaint, they begged Euse-

bis, in the name of ancient friendship, to again undertake the task of fraternal correction. But when he assured them that there was no prospect of success, they sent to the monastery an order commanding the presence of Eutyches in the Synod. The abbot replied that his vow would not permit him to leave his monastery; that the accusation of Eusebius was the result of enmity; that he was ready to sign the decrees of Nice and Ephesus, but that he would not follow the whims of the bishops when he deemed them contrary to truth; that he acknowledged one Nature in the Incarnate God; and that, in fine, he relied upon the Scriptures alone, as being of more weight than the expositions of the fathers. The Synod now summoned the recusant again and again, and after the third citation he sent several monks to report that he was sick, and to answer in his name the questions of the fathers. Flavian, however, repeated the injunction for the personal attendance of Eutyches, for he well knew that the excuse was a lie. During the interval that passed before the next session of the Synod, the obstinate monk used his influence at the imperial court (1) to obtain from Theodosius a rescript, drawn up ostensibly in the interests of peace, but calculated to terrify the more weak of the prelates. When the Synod resumed its sessions, Eutyches entered the hall with a turbulent crowd of his brethren, flanked by a band of Praetorian guards, headed by the Great Silentarius (2) of the emperor. But the bishops were not deterred from the fulfilment of their duty. They listened to the mandate of Theodosius with respect, and then proceeded to business. They carefully questioned Eutyches, and the result of the investigation was the following sentence delivered by Flavian: "Eutyches, once a priest and archimandrite, has been found infected with the errors of Valentine and Apollinarius, and to unchangeably agree with their blasphemies; he has not revered our persuasions and teaching, nor consented to the right doctrine. Whence with tears and groans

(1) The eunuch Chrysaphius, first chamberlain to Theodosius, was godson of Eutyches and devoted to him. When Flavian was consecrated, this officer applied to him for the usual present to the emperor, of which, of course, he was to have a share. The bishop gave him, instead of golden leaves, some of pure bread. From that day, Chrysaphius moved the court, especially the feminine element, with intrigues against him. NICEPHORUS, *b.* 14, *c.* 46.

(2) This officer was the first counsellor of the Byzantine rulers, and was styled "Silentarius" from the secrecy necessary in his functions.

we have decreed his perfect perdition through our Lord Jesus Christ, whom he has blasphemed, and he is deprived of every sacerdotal office, of our communion, and of the rule of his monastery; all knowing this, that if henceforth they speak or treat with him, they themselves incur the pain of excommunication." To this decree subscribed thirty-two bishops, as judges, and twenty-three abbots as assenting (1).

Eutyches now appealed to Pope St. Leo I., and endeavored to secure the intercession of St. Peter Chrysologus, bishop of Ravenna. The latter declined to interfere, but wrote, "In all things we exhort thee to obediently attend to what is written by the Most Blessed Pope of Rome, for the Blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his own See, gives to seekers the truths of faith." In his appeal to Pope Leo, Eutyches declared that Eusebius had shown nothing wrong in his belief; that he had been deprived of his rights, although he professed the Nicene faith. As Flavian had not yet written to the Pontiff upon these matters, St. Leo applied for information to that prelate and to Theodosius. Flavian immediately replied, enclosing the *Acts* of the Synod which had condemned Eutyches. Soon after the receipt of Flavian's letter, the Pontiff sent the celebrated *Dogmatic Epistle* which was afterwards read at Chalcedon, and of which we shall treat at some length. By the help of the eunuch Chrysaphius, Eutyches now prevailed upon Theodosius to call a Synod at Ephesus, for an examination of his case, and lest his sentence should be confirmed, if the Papal legates were to preside, he induced the emperor to issue an edict conferring the presidency upon Dioscorus of Alexandria. This Synod was attended by 130 bishops, and by four Papal legates. These latter, when they became aware of the violation of the Pontifical rights by Dioscorus, demanded that their credentials should be read, and Dioscorus swore to do so; again and again the demand was repeated, and each time it was evaded. Therefore, though they remained as witnesses, the legates took no official part in the proceedings. Theodosius, deceived by Chrysaphius, regarded Flavian as a wicked cause of all the Eutychian tu-

mults, and in a rescript to Elpidius, Count of the Consistory, which was afterwards read in the first *Action* of the Council of Chalcedon, he excluded from the right of suffrage not only Flavian, but all the bishops who had condemned Eutyches, and gave to Elpidius constabular authority to enforce the decision. In this Synod, held in 449, Eutyches was restored to communion and to the government of his monastery; Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylæum were deposed from their sees. When some of the bishops threw themselves at the feet of Dioscorus in intercession for Flavian, the soldiers and monks fell upon them with blows. A scene of horror ensued, in the midst of which the Papal legates protested, and Flavian appealed to Rome. This intrepid prelate was then attacked by the monks, headed, according to the testimony of many bishops in the fourth *Action* of Chalcedon, by the abbot Barsumas. So severely was he wounded that he died a few days after, while being carried into exile. From this epitome of the facts, may be gathered the wisdom of those who styled this assemblage at Ephesus a "Robber Synod." Theodosius not only refused to allow a reconsideration of the *Acts* of this Synod, but he made an express law as to the respect to be shown for them. This emperor died in the year 450, and his successor, Marcianus, agreed to forward St. Leo's project of a General Council to heal the wounds of the Church.

This Council at first met in Nicæa of Bithynia, in September, 451, but for the convenience of Marcianus and the senate, who wished to witness the proceedings, the fathers adjourned to Chalcedon, a town not far from the capital. The Pontifical legates were Paschasinus, bishop of Marsala, Lucentius, bishop of Ascoli, and the priests Boniface and Basil; to these was afterwards joined the bishop Julian. The number of bishops in attendance was nearly six hundred.

As to the convocation of the Council of Chalcedon, much need not be said. Alexandre holds that it was convoked by Marcian, with the consent of St. Leo; but his arguments do not prove that it was not convoked by the Pope, with the consent and assistance of the emperor. That Marcian

faithfully labored to make the Council a success, as did Constantine in the case of Nice, is certain, but his letters to the Pontiff and his actions in the Council go to show that, no more than Constantine, did he wish to encroach upon the prerogative of Rome. In the epistle of Valentinian and Marcian to St. Leo, which was read in the first part of the Council, occur these words: "We deem it right in the beginning to address your Holiness as possessing the principality in the episcopacy, inviting and praying, &c." These words do not indicate any disposition upon the part of the emperor to usurp the initiative in the matter of convocation, nor do the following: "If it pleases your Blessedness to come into these parts, and to celebrate a Synod, deign to do so for love of religion, and you will certainly satisfy our wishes, and point out what will be useful to religion. If, however, it is laborious for you to come hither, let your Holiness manifest it to us by letter, so that our letters may be sent through the entire East, and into Thrace and Illyria, for all the bishops to meet in some definite place, where it may please us, to dispose things for the good of the Christian religion and the Catholic Faith, as your Holiness, according to the rules of the Church, may define." If the authority of the Supreme Pontiff had not been invoked for the summoning of the Council, the legate Lucentius would not have so confidently accused Dioscorus, because "when he had no power to judge, he presumed and dared to hold a Synod, without the authority of the Apostolic See, which was never done, *nor was permitted to be done.*" Pope Gelasius, in his letter to the bishops of Dardania, says that, "The Apostolic See *alone* decreed that the Synod of Chalcedon should be held." To this testimony Alexandre says that in his Roman Synod the same Pope spoke "otherwise," when he declared that the Roman Church accepted "the Holy Synod of Chalcedon, congregated *by means of* Marcianus." But Gelasius does not here speak "otherwise." In this very phrase "by means of" (in the original, *mediante*) lies the very essence of the question. The Council was certainly convoked "by means of" the emperor, when he afforded the aid of his government in summoning the bishops, in

procuring them safe and free transit to and from the place of meeting, in entertaining them, &c. The far-reaching and well-organized machinery of the imperial government was made to take the place held now by the post-office, and without it the summonses could scarcely have been served; the same machinery was necessary to secure the prompt attendance of the Synodals. In this sense of aiding the Roman Pontiff, and in no other, did Marcian convoke the Council.

In noting the *Actions* of the Council, we shall speak only of the most important, and with the brevity which becomes our limits. In the first *Action*, at the instance of the Papal legates, it was resolved that Dioscorus could not sit in the Synod as a judge, but that he might be placed in the middle as a culprit. The *Acts* of the Constantinopolitan Synod of Flavian and of the Robber Synod of Ephesus were read, and Flavian and Eusebius of Dorylæum were vindicated from the charges brought against them. The same punishment was decreed to the leaders of the Robber Synod as they had pronounced upon their victims. In the second *Action*, the Faith was considered. The Symbols of Nice and Constantinople were read; also, the two Synodical Epistles of St. Cyril, and the Dogmatic Epistle of St. Leo to Flavian, the latter being received by the bishops with the cry of "Peter has spoken through Leo," and with other devout acclamations. Then a debate ensued about Dioscorus, some exclaiming "Dioscorus to exile," "Christ has condemned Dioscorus," "He who communicates with Dioscorus is a Jew;" others crying out, "We all have sinned, let all be pardoned." In the third *Action*, by order of the legates, were read the accusations made by Eusebius of Dorylæum against Dioscorus. Thrice summoned to appear, the culprit refused to obey. Then the Papal legates pronounced sentence against him for having received Eutyches into communion when he had been canonically excommunicated; for having prevented the reading of Pope Leo's Epistle to Flavian at the Robber Synod; for pretending to excommunicate the Pontiff; for having contemned the Council. "Hence," they said, "by us and through the present Holy Synod, the Most Holy and Most Blessed Leo,

Archbishop of the great and senior Rome, together with the thrice Blessed, and worthy of all praise, Apostle Peter, who is the rock and foundation of the Catholic Church, and the basis of right Faith, has denuded him of the episcopal dignity and removed him from every Sacerdotal ministry." In the fourth *Action*, the fathers accorded a delay of five days before they would proceed to an inquisition on faith, in order that Anatolius of Constantinople, and a number of those who had subscribed to Pope Leo's Epistle, might explain certain of its passages to some of the bishops. When they again met, all the Synodals subscribed to the document. It was then ordered that a certain petition should be read which a large number of abbots and monks had presented to Marcian, asking him to bring about another Synod, as they could not recognize the present one as general, since Dioscorus was excluded from a seat among the judges. When asked to subscribe to the Dogmatic Epistle of the Pontiff, the monks refused, declaring that this requirement was of a piece with the system of persecution which the secular clergy always exercised towards them. The meek creatures finally threatened to withdraw from the communion of those bishops who would vote for anything contrary to their humble petition. At this juncture, Ætius, archdeacon of Constantinople, read a canon of a Council of Antioch, in which it was ordained that any one suspending his own communion, and refusing to obey his bishop, if he ordered the suspended to return, should be degraded forever; that if he should cause sedition in the Church, he should be handed over to the secular power. To this canon, the fathers assented. In the fifth *Action*, a definition of faith was read, but the Papal legates and some Orientals contended that it was not sufficient to declare that Christ is "from two Natures;" that it should be stated that He is "in two Natures, inconfusedly, immutably, and undividedly." Thus it was finally arranged. In the sixth *Action*, the emperor Marcian was present, and he presented certain decrees to the Council, recommending their adoption. "There are certain Chapters," he said "which we have reserved in honor to your Reverences, deeming it proper that such things

should be regularly established in this Synod, rather than by our law." The first of these decrees prohibited monks from building monasteries without the consent of the bishop; the second ordered clergymen not to engage in secular business; the third prevented clerics from passing from one diocese to another, at their own free will. In the next eight *Actions*, were considered the causes of many individual bishops; among others, those of Theodoret, and Ibas of Edessa, who were restored to their sees. In the fifteenth *Action*, while the Papal legates were absent, the Synod edited twenty-eight canons, of which the last confirmed the famous Constantinopolitan canon conferring the first place after Rome upon Constantinople. In the sixteenth *Action*, the legates demanded the reading of the twenty-eighth canon and requested the fathers to reflect upon the circumvention which must have been used ere they were compelled to sign the "non-*conscrib*ed canons which they mentioned" (1). The bishops chafed at the word "compelled," and cried out that "no one was forced to sign." Then the legate Lucentius, persisting in his opposition, Ætius, archdeacon of Constantinople, asked if the Pope had included this opposition in his instructions. The legate Boniface replied by reading from the Diploma of Legation, the following: "Suffer not the Constitutions of the Holy Fathers to be violated or diminished by any temerity, preserving in every way the dignity of our person in yourselves, whom we have sent in our place; and if it chances that any city, confused by its splendor, tries any usurpation, repel the attempt with becoming constancy." Nevertheless, the bishops persisted in editing the canon, whereupon Lucentius protested in these terms: "The Holy See commanded that everything should be done in our presence; therefore we ask of your Sublimities that you order to be cancelled all that was consummated yesterday in our absence; otherwise, let our contradiction cling to those proceedings, as we shall know what to refer to the Apostolic and Principal Bishop of the Church, that he may pronounce sentence as to the disregard of the canons and as to the injury offered to his See."

(1) The legates styled the Constantinopolitan canons "*non-conscripti*" because the Holy See had not received them.

Our attention is now claimed by the Dogmatic Epistle sent by Pope St. Leo to Flavian of Constantinople, when he had received from that prelate a copy of the *Acts* of the Synod held by him against Eutyches. The *Acts* of the Council of Chalcedon show that this epistle was received by the fathers with acclamations of joy and of praise, but the adversaries of Papal infallibility hold that, before the bishops gave their assent to the doctrine contained therein, they subjected it to a juridical examination. That such was not the case, but that the fathers of Chalcedon received the letter of the Pontiff as an authoritative and infallible exposition of Catholic doctrine, we now proceed to demonstrate. But it is well to know at once in what light the Pontiff himself regarded this letter. It is certain that when the Robber Synod was about to be held, St. Leo declared that no doubt was to be entertained as to the heresy of Eutyches, since in his epistle to Flavian he had made plain the Catholic doctrine. In his letter to Theodosius, written immediately after the one to Flavian, he says that he has sent legates to Ephesus, "in order that, because there can be no doubt as to what is Christian doctrine, the gravity of the whole error may be condemned, and he who has erred may experience sacerdotal benevolence, if he asks for pardon. . . . . As to what the Catholic Church universally believes and teaches upon the Incarnation of our Lord, it is more fully contained in the letters which I have sent to our brother bishop, Flavian." Writing to the bishops congregated at Ephesus, he plainly tells them what they are to do; he says that his legates "will establish what will be pleasing to the Lord; that is, at once the pestiferous error being condemned, let the restoration be considered of him who has imprudently erred; provided, of course, that he accepts the true doctrine, and that he clearly and openly, with his own voice and hand, condemns the heretical ideas into which his ignorance has led him." In another letter to Theodosius (No. 17), he says that he needed not to have called a Synod, which certainly indicates that he did not wish his decision to be critically examined. The mind of St. Leo is made more clear to us by his saying to the fathers of Chalcedon, "In my vicars I am now pres-

ent, who but lately was not absent in the teaching of the Catholic faith; that you, who cannot ignore what we must believe from ancient tradition, may not doubt as to what we desire. Wherefore, most dear brethren, the audacity of dispute against divinely inspired faith being left aside, let vain infidelity of error subside. Let not that be defended which cannot be believed, since by the letters which we sent to bishop Flavian of blessed memory, it has been most fully and lucidly declared, according to evangelical authority, according to the voices of the prophets, and according to Apostolic doctrine, what is the pious and sincere confession in regard to the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ." The writer of these words would assuredly be surprised, did he hear that his teaching was subjected to critical disquisition. In his letter of instructions to the bishop Julian, whom he joined to the legation of Chalcedon, probably on the death of Julius of Puteoli, St. Leo says, "I have written to our brother Flavian sufficient for you and the Universal Church to learn the ancient and singular faith which the ignorant opponent has attacked, that which we hold as divinely delivered, and which we undeviatingly preach." Does this sound like the language of one who expected his instructions to be weighed and discounted? When the news of the disgusting scenes at the Pseudo-Synod of Ephesus arrived at Rome, the Pontiff wrote again to Theodosius, and ascribed much of the wickedness of that body to the cunning of Dioscorus in withholding the letter to Flavian, for, said he, "If the Alexandrian bishop had permitted our letter to Flavian to reach the ears of the bishops, all the noise of dispute would have been quieted by the manifestation of that most pure faith which by divine inspiration we have received and hold." And when it was finally determined to hold the Council of Chalcedon, and he selected Paschasius as his first legate, he sent to him a copy of the epistle to Flavian, saying, "I have sent to you, to be diligently studied and learned, the epistle which we sent to Flavian of blessed memory about this matter, and which the Universal Church receives."

And now for the manner in which the Council of Chalce-

don received this epistle. That the Council acknowledged a really dominative power in the Pontiff may be seen at once from its obedience to his mandate that Dioscorus should not judge in the Synod, but only be heard. In the first *Action*, the legate Paschasinus said, "We have in our hands the commands of the Most Blessed and Apostolic Pope of Rome, which is the head of all the churches, by which his Apostleship has deigned to order that Dioscorus, the Archbishop of the Alexandrians, shall not sit in the Council, but may be admitted as a hearer." Evagrius, b. 2, c. 4, tells us how the Synod obeyed. "There were present in the Council, the bishops Paschasinus and Lucentius, Vicars of Leo; also Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, to whose number were added the chief senators, to whom the Vicars of Leo declared that Dioscorus should not sit with them in the Council, as so it had been decreed by their bishop Leo; that if it were not so observed, they would go out of the church. Which when they had said, and by order of the senate Dioscorus had been placed, &c." But to come nearer to the point, why should the fathers of Chalcedon have wished to subject the epistle of Leo to the crucial test, when already, throughout the world, it had been regarded as definitive? Not only in the East, but in the West, it was already regarded as a declaration of orthodoxy, and a subscription to it was the test of faith. Thus, we find the emperor Marcian declaring that, if the Pontiff could not come to the East, all the bishops would agree with what he had defined; we hear the bishops of Gaul (Ballerini, *epist.* 68) designating the epistle as one approved of by the whole Church; we see it sent to all the metropolitans to be subscribed by them (*act.* 4, Conc. Chalced.) But let us come to the Council. In the first *Action*, a question was raised as to the faith of Flavian, and it was settled at once when the Papal legates declared that he believed whatever Leo proposed to be believed. Is this acquiescence likely on the part of men about to doubt of the criterion? In the second *Action*, the fathers declined to frame a new exposition of faith, on the ground that the Nicene, Constantinopolitan, and Ephesine decrees were sufficient for Arius and Nestorius, and Pope Leo's epistle settled the question of

Eutyches. Were they about to examine the decrees of the three general Councils? In this session, the epistle was read, and these were the cries that accompanied and followed it: "This is the faith of the fathers, and of the Apostles. We all thus believe. Anathema to him who believes not thus. Peter has spoken through Leo. The Apostles so taught. Leo and Cyrillus have so taught. Why were these not read at Ephesus? Dioscorus hid them." Of no avail as an argument against us is the delay asked for by Atticus of Nicopolis and a few others, for we read in the records, "Let the session be deferred five days, that those who doubt may be taught. All the bishops exclaimed, 'We believe thus. As Leo believes, so do we. We have already subscribed.'" In the fourth *Action*, the legates declared that "the letters of the Most Blessed and Apostolic Leo, Pope of the Universal Church, condemning the heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches, have explained what is the true faith. Similarly, therefore, the Holy Synod holds this faith, and follows it; nothing can it add or subtract." And when some of the Egyptian bishops sought to evade an open condemnation of Eutyches, the Synod insisted upon their immediate subscription of the Pontiff's epistle, stigmatizing as a heretic any one refusing to obey. In the face of all these facts, it is plain that the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, from the very beginning, respected Pope St. Leo's epistle as a certain rule of faith.

Alexandre agrees with Bossuet in finding a proof of the superiority of a Council over the Roman Pontiff in the fact that Pope Leo allowed the cause of Dioscorus to be treated at Ephesus and at Chalcedon, even though he had issued his Dogmatic Epistle. And he adduces the testimony of the Pope himself to show that he believed in this superiority; for in his Synodical Epistle to the fathers at Ephesus, St. Leo says that the emperor wished for a Council, "in order that, *by a fuller judgment*, every error might be swept away." But we have already seen that the Pope told Flavian that the affair "needed no treatment whatever by a Synod;" that he told Theodosius that 'for reasonable causes he should refrain from calling a Synod;' we have heard St. Peter Chrysologus advising Eutyches to obediently attend to what

the Roman Pontiff would write, because "the Blessed Peter shows to seekers the true faith." If, in the face of all this, at the request of the emperor, a Council was called, the Pontiff so permitted, not because he thought an œcumenical Synod superior to himself, but to repress the contumacy of the heretics, by leaving them no possible excuse for their obstinacy. Indeed, asks Roncaglia (1), in treating of this objection of Bossuet, who ever heard an inferior judge declare that a superior tribunal was supererogatory in his regard? And yet, in the supposition of Bossuet, such would have been the presumption of St. Leo. Again, in his epistle to the fathers at Nicæa (afterwards at Chalcedon) the Pontiff forbade any disputation upon faith, because he had already, in his epistle to Flavian, fully explained what was to be believed. Writing this, could he have dreamed of a critical examination of his letter? St. Leo assented to the holding of a General Council, concludes Roncaglia, but in it he was to be dominant; what he desired, was to be done; disputes were to be avoided, and his Dogmatic Epistle to Flavian was to be the rule of faith in the matter of Eutychianism. But, it is urged, be all this as it may, the Chalcedon fathers did, nevertheless, institute a judicial inquisition into the letter to Flavian, for the method of subscription adopted by the prelates can be understood in no other supposition. Having read the letter, and found it concordant with the doctrines of the first two Œcumenical Councils, the bishops signed their names in this guise: "It agrees, and I have subscribed;" "Having found it to agree, I have subscribed;" "Persuaded that it agrees in all, I signed." These subscriptions are certainly sufficiently formal, but they do not necessarily indicate that their authors had held a judicial, rather than an informatory, examination of the document. Besides, many of these subscribers had long before assented to this epistle as to a test of their orthodoxy; why, then, should they now inquire into its value? But let us look a little closely into the *Acts* of the Council. In the fourth *Action*, when the Apostolic legates declared that the Epistle of

(1) *Animadversions on Alexandre's 12th Dissertation*, 5th Century; § 3.

Pope Leo contained the true faith, and that the Synod "could not add nor subtract from it," the bishops exclaimed, "We all thus believe; so we were baptized, so we baptize." And this declaration as to not adding to, nor subtracting from, the letter, was made *before* its comparison with the doctrine of Nice and Ephesus. When, therefore, they afterwards approved of the document, they did so, not because anything was wanting to render it irrefragable, but that they might show that they acknowledged in it an authoritative teaching as to the Incarnation of our Lord. That this is the proper view to take of their action, is made manifest by what followed in the fifth *Action*. The fathers had framed a Profession of Faith, and cried out that he was a heretic who would not sign it. But the legates protested that it was not proper, and demanded that it should be amended, so as to be thoroughly consonant with the Epistle of the Pontiff, saying, "If it does not agree with the letter of the Apostolic and Most Blessed Pope Leo, order a rescript to be given to us, that we may return; and there let the Synod be completed." The bishops yielded, thereby showing that they held no heterodox notions as to the reformability of a Papal decree by a General Council, and that their examination of the Epistle to Flavian was merely for a better understanding of its contents.

The defenders of the doctrine that a General Council is superior to the Roman Pontiff bring forward another testimony to their theory from Pope St. Leo. In a letter (No. 120) to Theodoret, written after the Council of Chalcedon, the Pontiff thus alludes to his Epistle to Flavian. "When certain persons, incited by the author of dissension, entered upon a war of contradiction, there came about a greater good from the Dispenser of all good things. . . . the truth itself more clearly shines forth, and is more firmly held, when, that which faith has first taught, an examination afterwards confirms. The value of the sacerdotal office is really resplendent, when the authority of superiors is so respected, that in nothing appears diminished the liberty of inferiors." According to our opponents, the Pontiff here acknowledges that after his Epistle had been com-

municated to the bishops of Chalcedon, doubt was yet legitimate, and that an examination was held upon its contents which resulted in its confirmation. This objection has already been, at least implicitly, answered. Do its propounders think that St. Leo had forgotten his instructions to his legates, that nothing written in the letter to Flavian should be questioned in the Synod? But looking into this letter to Theodoret, we find the Pontiff affirming that the Lord Himself had defined the truth in his Epistle to Flavian. Did he believe that there was any deficiency of authority in the definition by God? We hear that the doubts alluded to were incited by the demon, and this certainly shows there was no foundation for them. And of what nature was this examination, which "confirmed" the teaching of the Pope? The approbation of others does not necessarily imply their superiority. In this very matter of the authority of Councils, St. Chrysostom (*hom.* 52) holds that the consent of the world confirmed the decrees of Nice, but were those decrees fallible until that assent was given? Facundus (b. 7) says that antiquity added weight to the Council of Ephesus. And the Council of Chalcedon itself, an assemblage of 600 bishops, presided over by the legates of the Holy See, underwent "confirmation" and "approbation," by order of the emperor Leo, and not only at the hands of bishops, but from such monks as were conspicuous for sanctity (1). It will be said that these prelates only gave a testimony as to their faith, when they "examined" and signed the decrees of Chalcedon. And just so, we answer, did the fathers of Chalcedon, when they "examined" and signed the Pontifical Epistle to Flavian.

(1) LIBERATUS; c. 14. FACUNDUS; b. 12.

## CHAPTER XXIX.

### THE ACACIAN SCHISM.

The seeds of the great Greek schism of the 9th century were sown several centuries before the baneful crop finally matured, and bore its poisonous fruit. If a mistaken idea of one's own dignity is often dangerous to the individual man, it is just as dangerous to a community whose leaders foster that spirit for the gratification of their own ambition. When the clergy, and through them the people of Constantinople, clamored for an ecclesiastical recognition of the dignity of "the younger Rome," their consciences certainly acquitted them of any designs on the peace of Christendom. But when they had obtained that recognition; when, in spite of the repugnance of far-seeing Rome, their bishop had been accorded an ecclesiastical rank above that of the venerable sees of Alexandria and Antioch; they but too often found that the newly-acquired pre-eminence was only an excitant to an appetite appeasable only by universal domination. At the time of which we are about to treat, the successor of the humble suffragan of Heraclea had not yet dared to claim the style of "universal patriarch," but he often exhibited an arrogance which caused the other patriarchs to chafe, and rendered the Supreme Pontiff chary of contributing in any way to his vanity. Under the Providence of God, it was only because the Byzantine empire was not yet sufficiently corrupt to give him the opportunity, that Acacius did not anticipate the work of Photius. As it was, he succeeded in inaugurating a schism which desolated the East for thirty-seven years. A sketch of the political history of the time will be necessary, that the reader may understand the full significance of the events which we are about to relate.

Upon the death of the emperor Marcian in the year 457, a military tribune named Leo, a Thracian by birth, was proclaimed his successor by the army; and, through the exertions of two powerful patricians, Aspar, and his son Arda-

burus, the senate confirmed him in the dignity. Leo was a firm Catholic, and hence, from the beginning of his reign, he insisted upon an exact observance of the decrees of Chalcedon, which the Eutychians used to evade in every possible manner. In the year 468, having concerted measures with the Western emperor, Anthymius, for the repression of Genseric the Vandal, he despatched a fleet to Africa under the command of Basiliscus, his brother-in-law. Through the cowardice of Basiliscus, the expedition failed, and the leader paid the penalty in exile. In the meantime, Aspar, to whom in a measure Leo owed his throne, had become hostile to his cause, and to oppose him, the emperor raised an Isaurian general named Zeno to the consulate, and gave him his daughter in marriage. But the inferiority of Zeno soon forced Leo to seek a reconciliation with Aspar, and he fulfilled his promise to make Ardaburus Cæsar. However, in a short time he put both father and son to death for conspiracy. Leo died in 474, leaving as successor, a five-year old grandson, Leo II., son of Zeno by the princess Ariadne. Zeno became regent, and the imperial child dying, he donned the purple. But Basiliscus, the cowardly brother-in-law of Leo I., now came to the front, and in the year 475 (1) he mounted the throne. Looking around for friends to secure his precarious tenure of power, he thought he might rely upon the Eutychians, if he could bind them with ties of gratitude. He therefore issued an Encyclical, in which he presumed to abrogate the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, and many bishops subscribed to it. Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, now came forward as the champion of the Church. But the event proved that he was incited, not by a pure zeal for religion, but by inordinate ambition. Among the canons of Chalcedon, as we have seen, was the famous 28th, giving to the "younger Rome" the second place in the hierarchy. Were this canon abrogated, Acacius would be indeed humbled, and to save it, he now posed as the strenuous defender of all the decrees. That we are guilty of no injustice to Acacius in denying that he respected all the

(1) So holds Muratori: Pagi assigns the rebellion to the year 476. But there are many laws extant which were promulgated by Zeno in 476: therefore, he had recovered his crown in that year.

religious decrees of Chalcedon, is fully proved by his satisfaction with the edict which Basiliscus afterwards issued, in which, while revoking the Encyclical, that emperor says nothing about the honor due to the religious enactments of the fourth Council, but is very precise about the restoration to Acacius of his suffragan dioceses.

When Acacius saw that the newly born dignity of his see was endangered, he used all his influence to excite resistance to the Encyclical. He doffed the brilliant robes of his office and appeared only in garments of sombre color; his episcopal throne, and even the altar, were draped in mourning. The people, who were, as a rule, thoroughly orthodox, were soon on the verge of sedition. They persuaded the mystic, Daniel the Stylite, to come down from his column, and to preach in the capital; he denounced all manner of evils to the tyrant, and produced such an impression that finally Basiliscus yielded. Throwing himself at the feet of the ascetic, he implored pardon, recalled the Encyclical, and confirmed the patriarchal privileges of Constantinople. But his retreat was of no avail. Zeno returned from his exile in Isauria, and though Basiliscus tried hard to win over the Catholics to his side, he was soon deposed and sent into Cappadocia to die of starvation. Acacius had now gained his point; it remains to be seen how his true character showed itself in his relations with the dissensions which were at this time rending the churches of Alexandria and Antioch. A retrospect is now necessary.

When Dioscorus was deposed from the see of Alexandria, Proterius was elected to fill the vacancy. But many of the people still clamored for Dioscorus, and so violent were they in their demonstrations, that Proterius was forced to employ a military guard for his protection. Shortly after his accession, Proterius condemned a certain Timothy Ælurus, and a deacon called Peter Moggus, who, out of sympathy for the deposed Dioscorus, refused to obey the new bishop. When the news of the death of the emperor Marcian arrived in Egypt, the Eutychians thought it safe to invade the patriarchal see. During the festivities of Holy Week of the year 457, a ferocious horde entered

**A**lexandria, broke into the baptistery of the church whither the bishop had fled, barbarously killed him, burned his body, and scattered his ashes to the winds. Some of them went so far as to devour portions of the burnt flesh (1). Leo I. had now become emperor, and the Alexandrian clergy besought him to punish the murder of Proterius, and to expel Timothy Ælurus, whom the heretics had thrust into the patriarchal chair. The Eutychians also had recourse to the throne, announcing that they received the Councils of Nice and Ephesus, but repudiating that of Chalcedon, and demanding the confirmation of Timothy Ælurus. Leo referred the question to Anatolius of Constantinople, who held a Synod of all the bishops then in the capital, and vindicated the Council of Chalcedon, and condemned Timothy. Anatolius sent an account of his action to Pope St. Leo, and this Pontiff wrote several letters to the emperor, urging him not to grant the demands of the Eutychians, who wished for another General Council to reconsider the decrees of Chalcedon. The emperor at length put a temporary end to the Alexandrian troubles by exiling Timothy to the Chersonese. Another Timothy, called Salophaciolus, was now legitimately elected to the see of Alexandria, and ruled in comparative peace until the year 461, when Timothy Ælurus reappeared, and the lawful bishop was expelled by the Eutychians. When Pope Simplicius heard of these events, he wrote to Acacius, and made him Apostolic legate, that he might the more efficaciously labor for the expulsion of Ælurus, and for the denial of the demand of the heretics for another Council. Ælurus finally poisoned himself, in the year 478, and the Eutychians replaced him with Peter Moggus. The latter was expelled from the see by order of Zeno, and the legitimate bishop, Timothy Salophaciolus, restored. Upon his death in the year 482, Timothy was succeeded by John Talaja, but this prelate was opposed by Zeno, incited by Acacius, whose anger had been aroused against Talaja, because he had not been formerly notified of the election. Talaja had written to the Pope and the patriarch Calendion of Antioch, and his omission of a notice to

(1) EVAGRIUS: *b.* 2, *c.* 8.

Constantinople, certainly appeared to indicate, in the mind of Acacius, that he agreed with Rome in rejecting the famous 28th canon of Chalcedon. Acacius now suggested to Zeno that it would be a good thing, in the interests of peace, to restore Peter Moggus to Alexandria, as he was in reality acceptable to all, and would readily support the *Henoticon* which Zeno had just issued (1). John Talaja was therefore deposed, and Peter seated in his place. In answering the letters informing him of the state of affairs, Pope Simplicius said that, in consequence of the serious allegations brought against Talaja (2), he had not yet sent him communicatory letters, but that he was astonished at the restoration of so pronounced a heretic as Peter Moggus; he would not restore Moggus to communion, even though he now professed the true faith, until he had done penance for his sins (3). In the year 483, Talaja appealed to Pope Simplicius, and the Pontiff wrote in his favor to Acacius. But this arrogant prelate would not forgive Talaja's seeming disrespect to his superior dignity. Pope Felix III., however, made Talaja bishop of Nola, which diocese he ruled for many years. Peter Moggus finally anathematized the decrees of Chalcedon and the Dogmatic Epistle of St. Leo, and fiercely persecuted the Catholics; notwithstanding which, Acacius persevered in his communion.

Having seen how Acacius conducted himself in reference to the dissensions of Alexandria, we will now give a brief sketch of his connection with an equally miserable condition of things in Antioch. One of the intimate friends of Zeno, at the time he was consul under the emperor Leo, was a certain priest named Peter, who was also surnamed Fullo, he having followed the fuller's craft while he was a monk. Settling in Antioch, Fullo began to preach the heresy of the Theopaschites, teaching, that is, that in the Crucifixion, the Divinity was affixed to the cross and placed in the sepulchre. Martyrius, the bishop, complained of him to

(1) This edict was suggested to Zeno by Acacius as a "unitive" measure, but it injured the Church very much, inasmuch as, while it condemned Nestorius and Eutyches, and approved the twelve Chapters of St. Cyril, it was silent as to Dioscorus, and said nothing about St. Leo's Dogmatic Epistle and the Chalcedon Definition of Faith.

(2) Acacius had charged him with violating an oath, taken never to accept the see of Alexandria; also with having obtained his election by bribery.

(3) *Epist.* 17

the emperor Leo, and that prince issued a decree prohibiting any monk from disputing on religious matters before the people. At length, Martyrius was exhausted by the tumults and seditions, which, under the protection of Zeno, the rebel continued to excite, and abdicated his see, saying, "I renounce a clergy without morals, a rebellious people, and a contaminated church; having preserved, in the meantime, my own sacerdotal dignity" (1). Fullo now seized the episcopal chair, but was soon deposed by a Synod, and exiled to the desert by Leo. Julian was elected to fill the vacancy, but when Basiliscus came to power, he ordered the restoration of Fullo, which caused Julian to die of grief. One of the first episcopal acts of Fullo was to consecrate a man very much like himself, a certain John, already under a Synodal censure, as bishop of Apame. But his people not receiving him, John was resolved to be a bishop somewhere, so he rose against Fullo, deposed him, and for three months was satisfied. But he was soon deposed by a provincial Synod, and Stephen was elected. In the year 479, this bishop fell under the murderous hands of a number of Eutychian schoolboys, who dispatched him with their sharpened writing reeds. Upon the election of Stephen "the Younger," Zeno (now emperor) sent his old friend Fullo into exile in Pontus. In three years' time, the see of Antioch was again vacant, and Calendion became bishop. And now Acacius had another opportunity to show the spirit that animated him. In the year 484, he presumed to depose Calendion, ostensibly because he was unfaithful to the emperor, but really because he held communion with Pope Felix and John Talaja. Acacius then brought out of exile the famous Peter Fullo, and restored him to his usurped see.

Having read this sketch of the iniquities of Acacius, the reader will not be surprised to hear that immediately upon the receipt of the news of the restoration of Fullo, Pope Felix III. held a Synod of 43 bishops, in which Acacius, Fullo, and Moggus were solemnly condemned. The sentence was made known at Constantinople by Tutus, "Defender" of

(1) *LIBERATUS*; *Breviary*, c. 13.

the Roman Church, and secretly affixed to the *pallium* of Acacius while at the foot of the altar, by some unknown monk. Supported by the friendship of the imperial court, Acacius exercised his ministry until his death, which occurred in the year 488. But the schism did not cease with him. His successor, Fravitas, sent Synodical letters to Peter Moggus, asserting that he did not communicate with the Roman Pontiff; he sent others to Pope Felix III., saying that he held aloof from Moggus. Which was truth, and which a lie, matters little; it is certain that he refused to remove the name of Acacius from the dyptichs, and thereby entailed upon himself the loss of communion with Felix. After a three months' rule, Fravitas died, and was succeeded by Euphemius, who would not communicate with Moggus, restored the name of Felix to the dyptichs, and held a lengthy correspondence with that Pontiff, and with Gelasius, but as he "feared" to erase the name of Acacius from the Ecclesiastical Tables, he never attained to communion with Rome. After Euphemius, came Macedon, a prelate of orthodox faith and of pure life. He incurred the enmity of the court by his inflexibility, and the emperor Anastasius induced some children to accuse him of immorality, and then sent him into exile. About the year 514, serious attempts were initiated to reconcile the church of Constantinople with the Holy See, and they came from the Eastern emperor, moved by fear of a certain "Master of the Soldiery," Vitalian, who had drawn the sword in the cause of the faith. When Anastasius felt himself driven to the wall by Vitalian, he wrote to Pope Hormisdas, referring all questions of faith and the causes of all the exiled bishops to the Pontiff, and asking for a Council to restore peace to the Church. Hormisdas sent four legates to the capital, with instructions not to accord ecclesiastical communion to the Oriental prelates or to the emperor, unless they subscribed to the faith of Chalcedon, and to the epistles of St. Leo against Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus. He also enjoined an explicit condemnation of Acacius and Peter Moggus, called the causes of all exiled bishops to the Apostolic See, and ordered the immediate restoration of all exiled orthodox prelates to their sees. Hor-

misdas also promised the emperor that he would attend the coming Council, waiving the rule of the Roman Pontiffs never to attend Oriental Synods unless by means of their legates. Athanasius dismissed the Papal legates, saying that while he condemned the *persons* and *dogmas* of Nestorius and Eutyches, and received the faith of Chalcedon, yet he could not accede to the condemnation of Acacius, for fear of scandalizing the Eastern churches; he hoped, however, that a future Council would settle everything. Hormisdas repeated his efforts for peace in the following year, but the arrogant emperor replied, "We can bear being injured, but not being ordered." In the year 518 the emperor Justin (the Elder) wrote to Pope Hormisdas, asking him to send legates to Constantinople, to finally reconcile that see with that of Peter. Accordingly, in 518, five Papal legates received the signatures of John, bishop of Constantinople, and of the emperor, to a formula of faith sent by the Pontiff. The condemnation of Acacius was accepted, and thus an end was put to the schism.

---

## CHAPTER XXX.

### THE *Palmaris* SYNOD, AND THE CAUSE OF POPE SYMMACHUS.

Pope Symmachus, a Sardinian by birth, and, at the time of his election, archdeacon of Sumana, ascended the Papal chair on Nov. 22, 498. Italy was at that time dominated by Theodoric the Goth, who having been sent in 488 by the emperor Zeno to crush Odoacer, had founded the line of Gothic kings which was to rule the peninsula until 553, when Narses would restore it to the empire. On the very day that Symmachus undertook the government of the Church, a grievous schism was inaugurated in Rome by the consecration of an anti-Pope, Laurence, of the title of St. Praxedes, whose election by a faction of malcontents had been procured by the money of Festus, a creature of the emperor

Anastasius (1). Blood was shed in the streets, and Theodoric interfered, declaring that he should be regarded as Pontiff, who was first elected by a majority of votes. But the schism was not easily healed. Festus, aided by the senator Probinus, accused the Pontiff of various heavy crimes, and sided openly with the Laurentians. The schismatics went so far as to urge Theodoric to appoint a Visitor to Rome, whose province it should be to investigate the charges against Symmachus. Peter, bishop of Altino, was accordingly sent to exercise the ungracious office of inspector into the doings of the Holy See, to the indignation of the Pontiff and the disgust of the faithful. A Synod was convoked by Peter in 501, but the Pope refused to attend it, or in any way countenance it. Theodoric, at this time, was devoting all his energies to the consolidation of his power, and, although an Arian, was desirous of conciliating the Romans. He therefore endeavored to put an end to the schism which his officious representatives had originated. He desired that another Synod should be held, and the Pontiff willingly co-operated. The first session was celebrated (502) in the Julian Basilica; the second in that of the Holy Cross; and the third in the vestibule of St. Peter's, the entrance to which, being designated as *palmaris* (excellent), has given its name to the whole Synod. Immediately upon entering the Council, Symmachus gave thanks to Theodoric for having furthered the meeting, and openly declared that it had been called by the Pontiff's own desire. In the first session, it was shown that the schismatics had been guilty of violence towards Symmachus, and had wounded many of his attendant clergy. When the Synod referred this crime to the cognizance of Theodoric, that Arian monarch gave an example to Catholic sovereigns as to their duty in treating ecclesiastical causes: "It was for the discretion of the Synod to prescribe what should be done in an affair of such moment; and

(1) Pope Anastasius II., the predecessor of Symmachus, had sent legates to the emperor Anastasius, to induce him to abandon the cause of the Acacians. At the same time with the legates, there arrived at Constantinople, a messenger from Theodoric, in the person of the patrician Festus. This nobleman persuaded the emperor that he could procure from Pope Anastasius a subscription to Zeno's *Henoticon*; hence the legates failed in their mission. But when Festus came to Rome to carry out his design, he found that another Pontiff, and one whom he could not hope to influence, was on the throne. He looked around for an instrument and selected Laurence.

for the sake of reverence to it, the king had nothing to do with ecclesiastical affairs. He committed to the will of the bishops, to decide what was the more useful, whether to attend to the affair in question, or not; provided that the venerable Council arranged that peace should be enjoyed by all Christians in the Roman city." The Synod then decreed that the cause of Symmachus should be referred to the divine judgment; that he should be regarded as pure of crime, and innocent of the charges brought against him; that he should enjoy all the rights of the Supreme Pontificate, in and outside of the city. As to the schismatic clergy, it was resolved that they should, in mercy, be allowed to retain their benefices, if they gave satisfaction to the Pontiff; if any of them should presume to officiate, without the Papal sanction, they should abide by the canonical penalties. The schismatics did not submit to the decrees of the *Palmaris* Synod; they sought to bring it into contempt by distributing among the people copies of an inflammatory circular entitled "Against the Synod of Unbefitting Absolution." To counteract this document, Ennodius, a deacon of Ticino, wrote an "Apology" for the Synod; and in another council, held in 503, the fathers decreed that the said writing should be regarded as possessing Synodical authority (1).

Launoy (2) adduces the history of this *Palmaris* Synod to

In this 5th Symmachian synod, the Pontiff excommunicated the emperor Anastasius, as an Acacian schismatic, and as a communicant with the heretical enemies of the Council of Chalcedon. Rendered furious by this apostolic act, Anastasius published a diatribe against Symmachus, in which, among other injuries, the Pope was styled a Manichean. In answer, Symmachus wrote an Apologetic Epistle, in which occur the following noteworthy passages: "You say that, the Senate conspiring with me, I have excommunicated you. I indeed have so done, but have only followed the reasonable example of my predecessors. We have excommunicated Acacius, not you; if you recede from Acacius, you will not partake of his excommunication. Have nothing to do with his excommunication, and then you will not be excommunicated by us; if you unite yourself with him, you are excommunicated by yourself, not by us. . . . Let us compare the honor of the emperor with that of the Pontiff; the former is as far from the latter, as are the human affairs, which the emperor directs, from the divine, over which the Pontiff presides. You, O emperor, receive baptism from the Pontiff; from him you receive the sacraments, you ask his prayers and beg his blessing, and beseech absolution. You administer human affairs, he dispenses divine things to you. . . . Perhaps you will retort that we should be subject to all the powers that be. We do indeed accord to every power its due respect, and until it raises its will against that of God. . . . Do you defer to God in us, and we shall defer to God in you. But if you do not defer to God, you cannot use His privilege, whose laws you despise." The student of Liturgy will note that it was this Synod which decreed that the "Glory to God on High," instead of being sung only at the nocturnal Mass of Christmas, should be sung on all Sundays and Feasts of Martyrs. Some authors have ascribed this Hymn to Pope Symmachus, but we know that it already existed in the time of St. Athanasius. See the latter's book on *Holy Virginity*.

(2) As we will frequently, during the course of our work, have occasion to combat the views of this eccentric writer, it may be well to note the opinion which Reiser, a famous Protestant author of his day, entertained of him. In a work published at Amsterdam in 1685, entitled, "John Launoy, a Witness and Confessor of Evangelico-Catholic (i. e., Lutheran) Truth," we are told that he was a "doctor of the Sorbonne, justly celebrated among his

prove that a Roman Pontiff may be cited for judgment in an episcopal Council. The fathers of this Synod, however, were of a different opinion. In the *Acts*, we read that the bishops of Venice, Æmilia, and Tuscany, met Theodoric at Ravenna, on their way to Rome, and asked why they should be compelled, in their old age, to make such a journey. "The aforesaid most pious king answered that many horrid reports had reached him concerning the actions of Pope Symmachus, and that a Synod ought to judge as to the truth of the hostile accusations. The aforesaid bishops suggested that he who was accused ought to convoke the Synod, knowing that the merit and principality of the Apostle Peter had first given him a singular power over the churches, and that afterwards, following the commands of the Lord, the authority of venerable Councils had recognized it; *nor was it in any way shown that the bishop of the aforesaid See was subject to the judgment of his inferiors*. But the most powerful prince signified that the Pope himself had shown, by his letters, his consent to a convocation of the Synod. His Gentleness was then requested to furnish the letters sent by the Pontiff, and he ordered that they should be given without delay." To escape the force of this testimony, Launoy replies that by the term "inferiors" in the cited *Acts*, we are not obliged to understand the bishops of the Church. Symmachus himself, as well as his predecessors, designated the bishops as his brethren, colleagues, co-ministers, fellow-priests, and brother-bishops. Symmachus, insists Launoy, was so far from thinking that the bishops were his inferiors, that he wrote (1): "As in the Trinity there is a one and individual power, so, among the various bishops, there is but one priesthood." Again, the bishops of the Roman Synod did not say to Symmachus: "We are not your judges; judge you yourself. Like the Prophet, you can say to God: 'To Thee alone have I sinned.'" On the contrary, these prelates heard the accusations, and pronounced judgment according

own: a diligent and irreconcilable enemy of the Roman Curia, and of all that is therein done and shamelessly taught, against Scripture and orthodox truth." In a reprint of Launoy's epistles, issued at Cambridge in 1689, Saywell premits a plea for the reformation of Anglicanism, "in which are treated the authority and use of Catholic tradition and General Councils, according to the explanation of Launoy."

(1) *Epistle to Æonius of Arles*.

to the evidence before their tribunal. But Launoy neglects to observe that the bishops of the Roman Synod show, in their remark to Theodoric, that they applied the term "inferiors" to themselves, and not merely to the clerics, senators, and people. Passing by the fact that they called "inferiors" those whom the king wished to judge the Pontiff's cause, who were certainly themselves, and no others, we note that they assign as a reason for their assertion, the sublime dignity of Peter and the power over the churches given him by the Lord. But this power was over the bishops as well as over the priests and people, over the sheep as well as the lambs. Were it otherwise, the Lord, on account of "the merit and principality of the Apostle Peter," would not have "given him a *singular* power over the churches," but only one common to the other bishops, and merely equal to their own. Nor do the words of Symmachus, which Launoy cites from the letter to the bishop of Arles, prove anything for the Gallican theory. The priesthood certainly is one, but there are in it, by the institution of Christ, certain grades of dignity and power, the chief of which is the Supreme Pontificate. The conduct of Pope Symmachus in reference to the bishops of Arles and Vienne shows that he regarded them as "inferior" to himself; when a controversy arose as to the relative position and privilege of these churches, he cited both prelates before his tribunal, judged the cause, and ordered both to observe the decrees of Pope St. Leo (1). Cæsarius of Arles regarded himself as "inferior" to Symmachus, when he wrote to him: "Just as the episcopacy takes its source in the person of Blessed Peter the Apostle, so it is needful that your Holiness should clearly indicate, by appropriate regulations, what each church should observe." The Oriental schismatics regarded themselves as "inferior" to the Pontiff, when, begging him to dissolve the excommunication which, as followers of Acacius, they had incurred, they declared: "Not only the power of binding is given you, but also, that you may imitate the Master, the power of loosing. . . . wherefore, we beseech you to cancel our later sentence, as Christ our Saviour and

(1) Epist. 2 and 9.

Leader cancelled the old one on the cross." Nor is the equality of the bishops with the Pontiff demonstrated by the judgment on Symmachus pronounced in the Roman Synod. For it is clearly shown in the *Acts* that the prelates did not judge until they were convinced of the consent of the Pope to such action. The mind of the bishops is fully illustrated in the *Apology* of Ennodius of Ticino, to which they gave Synodical authority: "God wished the causes of other men to be decided by men; but He reserved to His own tribunal, without question, the Ruler of this See . . . . . To one only was it said 'Thou art Peter,' &c. By the voice of the holy Pontiffs the dignity of this See is made venerable throughout the world; for wherever there are any faithful, there submission to it is practised, and it is called the Head of the whole body. It seems to me that to this (dignity) refers the saying of the Prophet: 'If this is humbled, to what help can you recur?'" That the mind of the bishops, in this matter, was the same as that of Ennodius, is shown by the *Acts* of the Fifth Synod, in which action was taken against those who contemned the *Palmaris* Synod. The prelates decreed: "Let the book be brought before us, and in our presence read and approved, which was written with Synodical authority by Ennodius, against those who presumed to mutter against the 4th Synod.' Which having been read, and unanimously approved, the Holy Synod said: 'Let these be preserved for future times, and let them be observed by every one, and in every point. Let this book be regarded by all as entirely Synodical, and let it be placed between the *Actions* of our Fourth and those of our Fifth Synod; and let it be held the same as the Decrees of these Synods, because it has been written and approved by the Synodical authority.' To which things the thrice Blessed Pope replied: 'Let it be done according to the will of you all, and as you judge; let the book have Apostolic authority, and let it be placed, as you say, among the Apostolic Decrees, and let it be held by all as are held the other Apostolic Decrees.'"

That the bishops of those days were fully persuaded that the Supreme Pontiff was not amenable to their tribunal, is also indicated by the manner in which the prelates of Gaul

received the news of the celebration of the *Palmaris* Synod. Perhaps they did not know that Symmachus had given his consent to the holding of the assembly, but, at any rate, the following complaining letter was sent, in their name, by Avitus of Vienne, to the senators Faust and Symmachus : “ While we were anxious and fearful for the cause of the Roman Church, feeling that our State tottered when its Head was attacked, . . . there was brought to us a copy of a sacerdotal decree, which the bishops of Italy, assembled in the City, had issued concerning Pope Symmachus. Although the assent of a large and reverend Synod rendered this constitution worthy of observation, we nevertheless knew that Pope Symmachus, if he had been accused in the world, ought to have received consolation from his fellow-priests, rather than judgment. . . . we cannot easily understand with what reason or law a superior is judged by his inferiors. . . . the same venerable Synod reserved for divine examination the cause which, saving the reverence due to it, it had rashly undertaken. . . . Which being known, I, a Roman senator and a Christian bishop, do solemnly call upon you. . . . that you do not less respect the See of Peter in your Church, than you do the height of power in the City. . . . If anything weakens in other priests, it may be strengthened. But if the Pope of Rome is called into question, not merely a bishop, but the episcopate, seems to totter. . . . He who governs the fold of the Lord will give an account of his care of the lambs entrusted to him ; for the rest, it is not the province of the flock to terrify the shepherd, but of the Judge.”

But why, it may be asked, did Pope Symmachus allow his case to be submitted to the *Palmaris* Synod, if he did not recognize its authority in the premises ? Simply because, in certain circumstances, it may become the duty of a person high in authority to see that no stain is inflicted upon his character ; to guard against any loss of reputation which would render his rule less efficacious ; to provide, in fine, against any scandalizing of the weak. Thus, more than once have Roman Pontiffs wished even the emperors to attest their innocence of crimes imputed to them. St. Sylvester,

accused of sacrilege, referred his cause to the tribunal of Constantine. St. Damasus, in similar circumstances, laid his case before Gratian. We read in the *Book of Lives of the Pontiffs* that Pelagius I. wished to vindicate himself, before the people, of the charge of having conspired against the life of Pope Vigilius. Anastasius tells us, in the *Life of Leo III.*, that the Pontiff brought together a large number of bishops and abbots, both Romans and Gauls, in the church of St. Peter, to certify to his innocence of certain crimes laid at his door ; that the prelates declared : " We do not dare to judge the Apostolic See, which is the head of all the churches of God. For by it, and by its Vicar, we are all judged ; it, however, is judged by no one. Such has been the ancient custom." The spirit which animated the Roman Pontiffs, when they sometimes permitted their actions to be discussed by their inferiors, was well illustrated by St. Gregory the Great (1) : Certainly Peter had received the power of the heavenly kingdom, that whatever he should bind on earth, &c . . . And because he had entered unto the Gentile Cornelius, having been impelled by the Spirit to do so, the faithful took issue with him. Nevertheless, this same prince of the Apostles did not answer the complaints of the faithful by appealing to his power, but by reason ; he explained the thing in detail. If, when he was accused by the faithful, he had thought only of the power which he had received over the Church, he could have replied that the pastor should not be reproved by the flock committed to his care. But had he alleged anything as to his power, when the faithful complained, he certainly would not have been a teacher of meekness."

(1) *Book 9, epist. 36.*

## CHAPTER XXXI.

### CONTROVERSY OF THE THREE CHAPTERS, AND THE FIFTH GENERAL COUNCIL.

A brief sketch of the history of those personages, whose aberrations gave rise to this controversy, is necessary, that the student may grasp its bearings in an intelligent manner. The prime cause of the dispute, although it occurred after his death, was Theodore, bishop of Mopsueste in Cilicia. In his youth, he was a protege of St. Chrysostom, and it was owing to the remonstrances and tender exhortations of this holy doctor, that he did not abandon his ecclesiastical aspirations for the allurements of a secular life (1). He was a man of erudition, and was very zealous against heresy; indeed, he was accused of being too fond of violence in that matter. Yet he did not himself escape contagion, and he communicated the poison to Nestorius, and was also the prime originator of Pelagianism. It is said that he taught two Persons in Christ, with only a moral union between them; also, that the Holy Ghost proceeds only from the Father; again, that original sin is not communicated to all men. He made a new liturgy which is used by the Nestorians of to-day. According to Lardner (2), he showed himself unfavorable to the Divinity of our Lord. Some Protestant critics have affected to doubt that Theodore really taught Nestorianism, but the great respect of the Nestorians of all times for his memory (they honor him as a saint) is suspicious. Only a few fragments of his works have come down to us. He died in the communion of the Church, but the Fifth General Council condemned his works as infected with Nestorianism. Theodoret, bishop of Cyr, in the province of the Euphrates (386-458), was also instrumental in giving rise to the controversy of the Three Chapters. He was learned and eloquent, and a voluminous writer. A

(1) *Letters of Chrysostom to "The Fallen Theodore."*

(2) *Credibility of the Gospel History*, vol. II., p. 399.

friend of Nestorius, he at first thought that this heresiarch merely expressed himself badly, but that his sentiments were orthodox. Opposed, however, to St. Cyril of Alexandria, whom he called an Apollinarist, he wrote against the *Anathematisms*, but afterwards recognized the mistake. He was cited before the Council of Chalcedon, and there he anathematized Nestorius, and was pronounced a Catholic. But unfortunately his writings against St. Cyril remained, and as they were composed in the heat of argument, they were often inaccurate in expression. Hence it was that these writings also were condemned by the Fifth Council. The third unconscious cause of much trouble was Ibas, bishop of Edessa, who, in a letter to a certain Persian, named Maris, denied that the Word took flesh from the Virgin Mary. He also attacked St. Cyril, and defended Theodore and Nestorius, but, in time he also was received as a Catholic by the fathers of Chalcedon. At the period of which we are about to write, many bishops believed that it was necessary to condemn these three men, because the Nestorians were pretending that their works had been approved at Chalcedon. The Eutychians, also, on their side, were anxious to procure the condemnation of these writings, in order to check the Nestorians; the great patron of the "Acephalous" Eutychians was Theodore of Cæsarea, who assured the emperor that these heretics would come into the Church if the condemnation were effected.

A glance at the ecclesiastical history of the time is now necessary. Upon the death of Pope Agapetus (536), the Roman clergy were influenced by the threats of Theodatus, king of the Goths, to raise to the Pontificate Silverius, a son born to Pope Hormisdas (d. 523) before he received orders. War was being waged between Theodatus and the emperor Justinian, and the Goth relied upon the fidelity of Silverius. Scarcely had the new Pontiff been enthroned, when he received from the ex-prostitute, now the empress, Theodora, a request to abrogate the decrees of Chalcedon against the Eutychians. As Silverius intrepidly refused her demand, the empress soon excogitated an impious scheme for the attainment of her end. There was residing

at the imperial court a certain deacon of the Roman Church, named Vigilius, whom Pope Agapetus had sent to Constantinople as legate. This ecclesiastic had already promised Theodora that if she would secure his elevation to the Papacy, he would further her wishes in all things; hence the wily woman turned now to him as a willing instrument. She furnished him with letters to the imperial general, Belisarius, then at Ravenna, and in them the latter was informed as to her designs. Proceeding to Rome, Belisarius accused the Pontiff of a design to deliver the city to the Goths, seized his person by treachery (1), and sent him to Lycia. He finally died in the year 538, whether by the sword or not, is unknown. The intruder Vigilius now became the legitimate Pope, for the Roman clergy, anxious to avoid a schism, canonically elected him to the vacancy. Then was seen a change which certainly seemed the work of God. This weak and ambitious man, who had scrupled not to stain his priestly character while an intruder, had no sooner become the true successor of St. Peter, than he became a model of Pontifical firmness. He wrote to Justinian, declaring that he "received the four General Councils, the Dogmatic Epistle of St. Leo, and the Decrees of his predecessors."

The controversy of the Three Chapters occurred during this Pontificate, and the following is a synopsis of its history. Pelagius, Apostolic legate at Constantinople, during the Pontificate of Agapetus, and Mennas, patriarch of that city, had influenced the emperor Justinian to issue an edict against certain doctrines of Origen. This condemnation greatly offended Theodore, bishop of Cæsarea, and he tried to induce the emperor to condemn three certain actions of the Council of Chalcedon. This Synod had received Ibas of Edessa and Theodoret of Cyr into communion, without any inquisition into their writings, and thus it seemed to approve of their attacks on St. Cyril, and hence, said the Eutychians, it lessened the authority of the Council of Ephe-

(1) The Pope had fled for safety into the basilica of St. Sabine, and the stepson of Belisarius promised on oath that if he would grant an interview to the general, his person would be respected. When he was seized, Silverius was stripped of the Pontifical insignia, dressed as a monk, and thus thrust into exile. In a short time, Justinian ordered his restoration, but Belisarius delivered him to Vigilius, who exiled him to the isle of Majorca.

sus. It had also restored Theodore of Mopsueste. Now Theodore of Cæsarea and the Acephali heretics saw that if these actions at Chalcedon were condemned, the authority of that Council would be greatly impaired, to their own very great benefit. This was the secret of the controversy; the Acephali desired to bring the Council of Chalcedon into disrepute. The word "Chapter," when it occurs in the title, and throughout the course of this dispute, means a certain act of the Council; so that when the condemnation of the Three Chapters is spoken of, allusion is made to an annulling, so far as it could be effected, of the *Acts* of Chalcedon according to communion to Theodore of Mopsueste, Theodoret of Cyr, and Ibas of Edessa. Justinian was about to issue an edict against the Acephali, when their secret friend, Theodore of Cæsarea, influenced him to rather condemn the three actions of Chalcedon which alone, said Theodore, kept the Acephali from receiving the Council's decrees and injured the peace of the Church. In the year 543 was issued the imperial decree abrogating the three Chapters; condemning, therefore, Theodore of Mopsueste, the teacher of Nestorius, and the enemy of Origenism (which was the tender point of the Cæsarean prelate); condemning also the epistle of Ibas of Edessa, written to Maris, and reprobating the writings of St. Cyril against Nestorius, while praising Theodore of Mopsueste; condemning finally the writings of Theodoret of Cyr, which attacked the *Anathematisms* of Cyril and defended the person of Nestorius. Justinian sent a copy of his edict to each of the patriarchs for their assent and signature. Those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, yielded to fear and subscribed; Mennas of Constantinople also signed, but on condition that his act would be void if the Roman Pontiff should disapprove of it. Many bishops subscribed, but deposited a protest with Stephen, the Papal legate, to the effect that they had been compelled by threats of deposition (1). The emperor in vain tried to procure the signatures of Stephen, and of Dacius of Milan, who was then in the capital. Among the many bishops who refused to sign the edict, was Pontianus, who wrote to Justinian in

(1) FACUNDUS; b. 4, c. 4.

a manner which showed that he well understood the animus of those who had prompted it : " At the close of your epistle we discovered that we were expected to condemn Theodore, and the writings of Theodoret, and the epistle of Ibas, which did not a little grieve us. Their sayings have not reached us. And if they had come down to us, and if we read therein some apocryphal things against faith, we might surely reject those sayings, but yet we would not precipitately condemn the authors. If they were still living, and had not retracted their errors, most justly could they be condemned. But now, to whom shall be cited our sentence of condemnation ? There is no room for correction. However, most pious emperor, I fear lest, with the pretext of this condemnation, the Eutychian heresy may raise its head, and that while we attend to lesser matters, we may come into collision with a greater heresy. And why should we wage war with the dead, when no victory can ensue from such a contest ? They have already stood before that Judge, from whom no one appeals. Through Him then, in whom you honor and cherish us, we beseech your Clemency, that peace may endure all your days, and that, while you seek the condemnation of the dead, you may not kill the many living who will disobey you, for you will be forced to account for it to Him who is to judge the living and the dead." Whether many of the responses to the imperial edict were so simply sublime, and to the point, as this of the noble Pontianus, we know not, but Justinian came to the conclusion that he would not succeed unless by meeting the universalepiscopate, face to face, in the imperial city. He therefore asked for a Synod, alleging the need of bringing the Acephali back to the fold, but in reality to obtain the condemnation of the famous Chapters.

Pope Vigilius, who had been as iron in his firmness in resisting the imperial demand, thought best to attend this Synod, though it was contrary to the traditions of the Papacy to attend such a meeting in person, and although he hesitated to leave his immediate flock, then in danger from the Gothic invader. He left the Eternal City in the year 545, but remained in Sicily for a year, both because he desired

the Synod to be held in that island, and because he wished to be near Rome in case it was troubled by the barbarians. He arrived in Constantinople on Jan. 25, 547, and was worthily received by Justinian. He immediately, in spite of the empress Theodora's love for them, promulgated a decree against the Acephali (1), and suspended the patriarch Menna; soon, however, at the request of Theodora, and owing, probably, to the saving clause which the patriarch had affixed to his signature to the edict, the suspension was revoked. In the beginning of the next year, 548, the emperor obtained from the Pontiff permission for a discussion upon the Three Chapters in a Synod of seventy bishops, but as there was very little harmony among the prelates, Vigilius reserved the question to himself, and issued a decree styled *Judicatum*. In this document, he condemned the Three Chapters, "*saving, in all things, the respect due to the Council of Chalcedon*," thus avoiding any reflection on the restoration of Theodore, Theodore, and Ibas, and condemning anything wrong in their writings. Far from being a harbinger of peace as Pope Vigilius had fondly hoped, this *Judicatum* proved a firebrand. Throughout the West, the Pontiff was accused of failing in respect to the decrees of Chalcedon, and the Africans went so far, in 550, as to pronounce him anathema. In such a state of affairs, both Pope and emperor deemed a General Council necessary, and letters were sent to the principal sees in all the provinces, convoking the Council in Constantinople. Very few of the Western bishops seemed willing to attend, and as the Pontiff was averse to any decided action in their absence, a new trouble arose. In vain did Justinian try to persuade Vigilius to unite with the Eastern prelates (of whom he felt sure) in condemning the Three Chapters. At the suggestion of the irrepressible Theodore of Cæsarea, the emperor issued, in 551, in his own name, a condemnatory edict, and ordered it to be placarded in various basilicas. When the Pope heard of this high-handed proceeding, he threatened to excommunicate all who would obey the edict. This action of Vigilius so enraged the emperor that he ordered his arrest, and it would

(1) ST. GREGORY THE GREAT; b. 2, *epist.* 36, to the Bishops of Istria.

have gone hard with him, had not the very soldiers refused to execute the imperial mandate. Justinian then solemnly swore to respect the person of the Pope, but there was good reason to distrust his sincerity, and Vigilius fled to Chalcedon, and took sanctuary in the basilica of St. Euphemia. The constancy of the Pontiff was not unrewarded, for the emperor withdrew his edict, and the bishops, who had signed it, begged pardon for the injury "done to his Holiness and the Holy See." Vigilius returned to Constantinople, and renewed his consent to a General Council, but providing that the East and the West should be equally represented. The Council met in May, 553, with an attendance of 165 bishops, but the Pontiff refused to attend it, or to accredit legates to it, on account of the small number of Western prelates present. Nevertheless, the Synod proceeded to an examination of the Three Chapters. When the fifth session had been held, the Pope sent to Justinian a document containing his decision as to the question at issue. He had already, for the sake of peace, withdrawn the *Judicatum*, but this new decree, styled a *Constitutum*, was essentially of the same tenor. He condemned the errors of Theodore of Mopsueste, but spared his name; he declared that nothing should be undertaken in reference to Theodoret or Ibas, since the Council of Chalcedon had refused to pass judgment upon their writings; he commanded finally that all should act in the matter of the Three Chapters in accordance with this *Constitutum*. This document is dated May 14th, but it is doubtful whether the emperor received it before the end of the Synod, or intentionally suppressed it; at all events, the seventh session was held on the 26th. of May, and then Justinian adduced the *Judicatum* of Vigilius and the anathemas pronounced against its opponents, as proofs that the Pope had condemned the Chapters. Then the Council, in its eighth session, definitively condemned them, in these words: "We condemn and anathematize, together with all other heretics who have been condemned and anathematized by the four aforesaid Councils, and by the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church: Theodorus, who was bishop of Mopsueste, and his impious writings; and whatever Theodoret wickedly wrote against the

true faith and against the twelve Chapters of St. Cyril, and against the first Synod of Ephesus, and what he wrote in defence of Theodore, and of Nestorius. We also anathematize the impious Epistle which Ibas is said to have written to Maris the Persian, in which he denies that God the Word took flesh from the ever Virgin Mary, the holy Mother of God, and was made man ; and in which he calumniates Cyril of holy memory, who taught the truth, as like unto Apollinaris. . . . and defends Theodore and Nestorius, and their impious dogmas and writings. We therefore anathematize the aforesaid Three Chapters, that is, &c." Then follow fourteen anathematisms, and it is to be noted that in the twelfth, the Council condemns the name, as well as the writings of Theodore ; but in the two last, it condemns merely the writings of Theodoret and Ibas.

Pope Vigilius confirmed the 5th General Council, and hence it acquired the quality of œcumenicity, which, during its sessions, it certainly wanted, owing to the absence of Papal legates. Some writers have held that Vigilius at first refused to confirm the Synod, and was therefore exiled by the emperor ; that after five years he yielded. But this is proved false by the confirmatory epistle, which says that it was: " Given on the 6th of the Ides of December, in the 27th year of the reign of our lord the ever august Justinian." This date is of the year 553, scarcely six months after the close of the Council. Again, the defenders of the Three Chapters are silent as to this exile, and it would have been an excellent argument for their cause, if they could have alleged that the Pontiff did not willingly and freely condemn them. The confirmatory decree of Vigilius was addressed to " Eutychius, Archbishop of Constantinople, and the entire previous Holy Synod," and reads as follows: " If wisdom requires that what is (justly) complained of, should be withdrawn, and we ought not to be ashamed to publish that which an after-study of the truth shows to have been omitted in the beginning, how much more proper is it to follow such a course in ecclesiastical discussions? Especially since the fathers, and notably the Blessed Augustine, who excelled in the study of Scripture and was a master in

Roman eloquence, revised his writings and corrected his sayings, supplying that which he had omitted and afterwards discovered. We also, incited by such examples, have never ceased, in the controversy of the above-mentioned Three Chapters, to investigate the truth in the writings of the fathers. . . . . We therefore anathematize and condemn the aforesaid Three Chapters; that is, the impious Theodore of Mopsueste, together with his impious writings; and whatever Theodoret wickedly wrote, and also the Epistle said to have been written by Ibas, in which the aforesaid blasphemies are contained. We also subject to the same anathema whoever believes that at any time these Chapters ought to have been received or defended, or whoever shall try to subvert this condemnation. . . . . Whatever has been hitherto done, either by me, or by others, in defence of the aforesaid Three Chapters, by this present writing we declare null and void."

Several questions are to be considered before we can dismiss this controversy. First, we must examine the justice of the decree issued by the Fifth Council in condemnation of the Chapters. We will commence with Theodore of Mopsueste. There can be no doubt of the heretical nature of some of his teachings. In his Symbol, he says that Christ was merely man; that He was the Son of God only by adoption; that there were two Persons in Christ, only morally, not hypostatically, united. This Symbol was condemned, in its 6th *Action*, by the Council of Ephesus, and is styled by St. Cyril "the first bubbling forth of Nestorian impiety" (1). In his book on the *Incarnation*, he says that the Word assuming, and the man assumed, are one only as man and wife are one. Among the petitions sent to Proclus of Constantinople, asking for the condemnation of Theodore, is one from the clergy of Armenia and Persia, in which they represent him as asking, "How can God and man be one, in real unity? He who saves, and he who is saved? He who was before all ages, and he who appeared, coming from Mary?" And then they demand that as Nestorius was condemned at Ephesus by name, and Theodorus *unnamed*

(1) *Epist. to Proclus.*

(since his errors were condemned), so this real author of the heresy be now reprobated by name. Rabbula of Edessa says to St. Cyril, that Theodore "first declared that the Holy Virgin was not the Mother of God." Leontius declares that Theodore prepared a liturgy for the Mass which was full of blasphemy, that he composed virulent commentaries on many books of Scripture. It is certain that Theodore was regarded as a heretic in his own church of Mop-sueste long before the Fifth Council, for in a Synod held there by order of Justinian, the clergy testified that, as far back as their memory went, the name of Theodore had been expunged from the dyptichs, and in its place that of St. Cyril substituted.

As for the writings of Theodoret, they were manifestly heretical, for they attack the doctrines approved by the Council of Ephesus, and patronize Nestorius, a condemned heretic. In his epistle to Andrew of Samosata, Theodoret thus speaks of the Council of Ephesus: "Egypt again madly rages against God, and wars with Moses and Aaron and His servants; the greater portion of Israel is in union with the enemy, and few indeed are the sane who suffer in the cause of piety. Everything venerable for piety is down-trodden. They who were deposed, exercise the sacerdotal ministry, and those who deposed them, groan at home (1). The Egyptians, Palestinians, Pontians, Asiatics, and the Westerns, play at holding a Synod." In his epistle to Domnus of Antioch, he exhorts the patriarch to prevent approbation of Cyril's anathematisms by the coming Council. In another epistle to Domnus, written after the death of St. Cyril, he thus insults his memory: "At last, indeed, the wicked man is dead. The good and the benign migrate before their time; the bad lead a long life. . . . . Your Holiness should order the corpse-bearers to place an enormously heavy stone on his grave, lest he come here again to show his unstable will. Let him take his new dogmas to hell; there let him preach, as he so likes to do, day and night." As for Theodoret's sympathy with Nes-

(1) The saintly groaners are, of course, John of Antioch and his worthy followers, whose exploits we have narrated when treating of the Council of Ephesus.

torius, we need adduce only the following (1): "Your Holiness knows that if one should anathematize, without restriction, the doctrine of this most holy and venerable bishop (Nestorius), it would be the same as to condemn piety itself.

The Epistle of Ibas was also justly condemned by the Fifth Council, because it accused the Synod of Ephesus of precipitation in condemning Nestorius; it vituperated the doctrine of St. Cyril, approved at Ephesus; it praised Theodore of Mopsueste as a preacher of truth and a doctor of the Church; and it finally contains doctrine *per se* Nestorian. The first point of accusation is proved by the words "They deposed Nestorius from the episcopacy, without any investigation." The second is shown by the following: "A contest ensued between those two men, Nestorius and Cyril, and they interchanged injurious language, which was a scandal to the hearers. Nestorius said in his books, that the Blessed Mary is not the Mother of God, so he was thought by many to belong to the sect of Paul of Samosata, who said that Christ was a mere man. Cyril, however, refuting the words of Nestorius, was slippery (2), and was found to have fallen into the error of Apollinaris. . . . They brought forth and approved the Twelve Chapters written by Cyril against the constituted doctrines of the true faith, and consented to them as agreeing with the faith." As for his praise of the Mopsuestene, the following is sufficiently pointed: "The blessed Theodore, preacher of the truth, and a doctor of the Church, not only while living attacked the heretics in the cause of faith, but after his death supplies in his books spiritual arms to the sons of the Church. He who dares everything has presumed to openly anathematize him, who, for zeal of God's cause, not only turned his own city from error to the truth, but taught the distant failing churches with his erudition." That he also taught Nestorianism is certain, for he asks, "How is it possible to receive the Word, which is from the beginning, for the Temple which was born of Mary? . . . No one dares to say that one is the nature of the Deity and

(1) *Epist. to Andrew of Samosata, in Marius Mercator.*

(2) The text has "lubricavit."

the Humanity, but he confesses the Temple and the Inhabitant therein, who is the one Son Jesus Christ." This distinction of the Temple, born of Mary; and the Inhabitant—the Eternal Word, was a favorite with Nestorius, nor is its heresy at all diminished in the case of Ibas, because he avows one Person. Nestorius also declared that there was but one Person in Christ, but one morally, not consubstantially. Facundus (1), a most energetic defender of the Three Chapters, says that "The assertion that there is one Person, does not exclude the subterfuges of the Nestorians, who, when they saw the innumerable testimonies of the fathers proving that God the Word and the assumed Man were one in Person, thought, or affected to think, that this signified the dignity of authority; so that Jesus Christ may be said to have borne the Person of the Word in the same manner as did the Apostle, writing to the *Corinthians*, II, 2, &c."

The Fifth General Council has been severely condemned by certain critics for its anathematization of Theodore of Mopsueste. He had died in the communion of the Church; indeed, he had, while living, never been deprived of it. For nearly a century he had been beyond the judgment of men, and it savors of indelicacy, at least, to inveigh against the dead. Such sentiment as this would be praiseworthy, and would certainly be respected by the Church, if the weighty interests of the living, and of future generations, did not carry her out of the realm of sentimentality. Several instances of regard for the dead can be cited, which at first sight seem to rebuke the Fifth Council for cruelty, so far as in it lay, to Theodore. Thus, St. Dionysius of Alexandria, when obliged to condemn the millenary doctrines of the dead bishop Nepos, spared his memory, because he had departed this life in the communion of Holy Church. But this case is very different from that of the Mopsuestene prelate. The error of Nepos had never been condemned by the Church; the question was obscure, and well disputed, and several of the fathers coincided with him. But Theodore taught doctrines already proscribed in the cases of Paul of Samosata,

(1) *Book I., c. 3.*

and Nestorius, and he attacked some of the principal points of doctrine, which were defended by all the fathers. The moderation then, which in the case of Nepos, and similar ones, was commendable, would have been out of place in that of Theodore. Pope St. Leo certainly tells us (1) that "there is no necessity to discuss the merits and acts of those who have thus died; for the Lord our God, whose judgments cannot be comprehended, has reserved to His justice that which the sacerdotal ministry could not carry out." But St. Leo here alludes to the soul's state in the other world; the passage does not at all affect the Church's right to pass judgment on the acts committed under her jurisdiction. It is said that Theodore died in the peace of the Church. So far as we can tell, he did not, for though he nominally belonged to the body of the Church, he persisted in his heresy, and deserved open excommunication, to the very last. Hence, Benignus of Heraclea accuses of lying those who said that Theodore died in the communion of the Church: "He dies in the communion and peace of the Church who up to the hour of death preserves and teaches the true dogmas of the Church; that Theodore did not preserve and teach the true dogmas of the Church is certain from his blasphemies." St. Cyril did not expressly anathematize Theodore at Ephesus, but his moderation proves nothing against the Church's right to do so. And Cyril's great object was the conversion of those who were devoted to the memory of the Mopsuestene bishop, and that object was better served by leniency towards his person.

We now approach the question, whether or not the Fifth Council, in its treatment of the Three Chapters, contradicted the Council of Chalcedon. In this latter assembly, Theodoret and Ibas were received as orthodox, and Theodore of Mopsueste was not condemned. It is not difficult to show that the two Councils stand in no need of conciliation. In the first place, the fathers of the Fifth Council expressly profess their veneration for the decrees of Chalcedon, and in their subscriptions to the *Acts*, use the words, "receiving the four Holy Synods, that is, of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus

(1) *Epist. to Theodore of Forum Julium.*

I, Chalcedon, and what was defined by them." St. Gregory the Great alludes to the apparent conflict between the two Synods, and he says (1): "As we sincerely cherish you, so much the more do we grieve, because you put faith in ignorant and foolish men, who not only do not know what they say, but can scarcely understand what they hear . . . . . We declare, upon our conscience, that nothing was moved concerning the faith of the Chalcedon Council, and in nothing was it violated; but whatever was done in the time of the aforesaid Justinian, was done without any prejudice to the faith of the Council of Chalcedon." But it is not true that one Council approved that which the other condemned. With regard to the epistle of Ibas of Edessa, which was condemned by the Fifth Council, it was not received by the fathers of Chalcedon as orthodox, nor could it have been, since the Chalcedon synod approved of the judgment given against Ibas at Berytum. In this judgment, Ibas was compelled to anathematize Nestorius, and to receive the Ephesian decrees. Now, as in the epistle to Maris, the Synod of Ephesus is vituperatively treated for its alleged unjust condemnation of Nestorius, it is plain that the Chalcedon fathers, approving the judgment of Berytum, could not have accepted the epistle as orthodox. Ibas was welcomed at Chalcedon; his writings were not. He was received as a Catholic, because he had contradicted the errors in his epistle. "Anatolius, bishop of Constantinople, said: I now put aside any suspicion about him (Ibas), because he consents and subscribes to the decree on faith now given by the Holy Council, and to the epistle of the Most Holy Leo, Archbishop of Rome." So say the records of Chalcedon; they also tell us that Juvenal of Jerusalem said, in the matter of Ibas, "The divine Scriptures command us to receive those who are converted. Therefore we receive those who return from heresy; I therefore consent that the most reverend Ibas, as he is now orthodox, and has sought our clemency, should preserve his episcopacy, because he is old." Again, Ibas was not restored to his diocese, before he had anathematized Nestorius. When ordered to do so, he replied, "I have already anathematized

(1) *Epist. to Theodolinda, Queen of the Lombards.*

Nestorius and his dogma in writing, and I now anathematize him ten thousand times."

Nor can we trace any dissension between the Fourth and Fifth Councils in the matter of Theodoret. The fathers of Chalcedon were exceedingly opposed to his writings, for when he entered the Council chamber, there resounded through the hall cries of "He is no bishop," and "Theodoret has attacked Cyril; we condemn Cyril, if we receive Theodoret." After the termination of the sessions on faith, he was ordered to anathematize Nestorius, and although he hesitated for a time, he finally did so. If the Chalcedon Synod did not demand from him an explicit condemnation of his own writings, it was because he had implicitly given one by subscribing to the fifth *Action*, in which, after the condemnation of Nestorius, the fathers received "the epistles of Blessed Cyril, bishop of the Alexandrian church, and the synodical letters to Nestorius and others in the East." So the affair is explained by Pope Pelagius II. (1).

The case of Theodore of Mopsueste shows no more difference between the two Councils than do those of Ibas and Theodoret. Because the Council of Chalcedon did not condemn Theodore, it does not follow that it believed his writings innocuous. Nor should we believe so, because he is praised by Sts. Gregory of Nazianzen and Chrysostom, and by other fathers. In the first place, this praise is not so sure, for there are good reasons for denying the authenticity of the epistle of Chrysostom cited by Theodore's partisans, and the praise of Nazianzen seems to have been meant, not for the Mopsuestene Theodore, but for another. But if this praise is authentic, we may answer with Benignus of Heraclæa, who, taking the place of the archbishop of Thessalonica in the fifth session of the Fifth Council, said, "It is of no avail to those who act wickedly, that it sometimes happens that some persons write in their favor, either through ignorance or presumption, or even by a kind of condonance. For St. Basil wrote some things for Apollinarius, but that did not free him from condemnation. And Athanasius wrote several epistles to Apollinarius, as to one holding the same

(1) *Epist. to the Bishops of Istria.*

faith; nevertheless, even after the death of Apollinarius, he wrote entire books against him, when he had found out his blasphemies; and those things which he wrote when he deemed the faith of Apollinarius his own, were of no profit to the latter. And even Leo of holy memory, Pope of ancient Rome, both received Eutyches, and wrote in approval of him, though he afterwards condemned and anathematized him as a heretic." In fine, those who praised Theodore, did so for one thing; the Fifth Council condemned him for another. Before we dismiss the question of the agreement of the Fourth and Fifth Councils in this matter of the Three Chapters, we would call the attention of the reader to the following passage of Pope St. Leo (1): "If anything which does not pertain to faith is reported to have been done by those brethren whom I sent in my place to the Holy Synod, it will be of no weight whatever; for they were sent by the Apostolic See to be defenders of the Catholic faith, by the destruction of heresy. For whatever is offered for episcopal examination, beyond the special causes for Synodal Councils, may bear some reason for adjudication." In these words, observes Pope Pelagius II. (2), "permission is plainly accorded to reconsider whatever was there done about persons, and outside of causes of faith." Even then, if the Fifth Council had reconsidered the action of the Fourth in the matter of Theodore, Theodoret, and Ibas, there would have been no essential difference between the two Synods, for, to use the words of Pelagius, "The special cause of Synodal Councils is faith. Whatever, therefore, is treated of, outside of faith, can be, according to the teaching of Leo, recalled to judgment." But we have said enough to show that the Fifth Council merely completed, in the case of the condemnation of the Three Chapters, a work which, for prudential reasons, the Fourth had left in abeyance.

We must now treat of the action of Pope Vigilius in this controversy. It would not be very strange if a Pontiff who entered upon his sublime office under such malignant auspices as those which frowned upon Vigilius at the outset,

(1) *Epist. to Marimus of Antioch.*

(2) *To the Bishops of Istria.*

should have proved a very weak Pope. But we have seen that a miracle, at least of grace, was worked in his case. The truculent schismatic was transformed into the zealous Pastor, and at no time during his stormy Pontificate did he betray a spirit unequal to martyrdom, had duty called him to it. His manner of action, during the controversy of the Three Chapters, has been attacked by Protestants, Jansenists, and all enemies of Papal supremacy. We shall pass over the accusation made by the first class, that is, that Vigilius erred in faith, for it is sufficient to be only moderately versed in the records of his time, to know that he abhorred all heresy, especially that of Nestorius and that of Eutyches. The Jansenists, however, have insisted that Vigilius erred in a "dogmatic fact." How they could do so, unless they were thoroughly blinded by prejudice, we are at a loss to understand. It is of the nature of a dogmatic fact of this kind that in a writing there be defined as existing, either a truth or an error. Now, neither in the *Judicatum*, nor in the *Constitutum*, did Vigilius act unless upon persons. Pope Pelagius II. says (1) that during the reign of Justinian, certain Chapters were discussed, "outside of faith," and "no action taken, unless on persons." Gregory the Great says (2) that "action was taken only in regard to certain persons." And Vigilius himself, in his epistle confirming the Fifth Council, expressly asserts the same. Again, in order to prove him guilty of an error in matter of dogmatic fact, the Jansenists should show that Vigilius at some one time approved of the writings in question. This they cannot show, for the whole course of events proves that the Pontiff wished to leave the Chapters just as they were left at Chalcedon, neither condemned nor approved. The foes of the Papacy accuse Vigilius of fickleness. First, they say, he defended the Three Chapters, and then he condemned them. But it is false that he defended them; he simply ordered, and for good reasons, their being left in the condition that had seemed good to the Fourth Council. Let us take a glance at the course of events. When the emperor

(1) *Epist. to Childebert, King of the Franks.*

(2) *Epist. to the Bishops of Istria.*

Justinian presumed to condemn the Three Chapters, Vigil-  
 ius threatened with excommunication, not only the imperial  
 meddler, but all who would subscribe to the edict. And  
 why? Apart from the crime committed by Justinian, there  
 were powerful reasons why the Pontiff should take such a  
 resolution. All the Occidentals, and a goodly number of  
 the Orientals, were indignant at what they regarded as an  
 attack on the Council of Chalcedon. Their mind is seen in  
 the epistle which the clergy of Italy gave to the legates of  
 the Frankish king Childebert, who were setting out for  
 Constantinople to protest against Justinian's sacrilegious  
 violence on the Pontifical person: "The most blessed Pope  
 Vigilus going to Constantinople, or, that the truth be de-  
 clared, being almost dragged there, they began to expect his  
 condemnation of certain chapters, by which condemnation  
 the Holy Synod of Chalcedon would be in every way broken  
 up. But when Pope Vigilus would not consent to this  
 thing, they acted so violently, that he cried out in the as-  
 sembly, 'Although you hold me captive, yet you cannot  
 make captive Blessed Peter the Apostle'" (1). It then ap-  
 peared to the Pontiff that both parties might be pacified by  
 such a condemnation of the Chapters as would leave intact  
 the dignity and authority of the Fourth Council. Hence he  
 drew up the *Judicatum*, and in the Encyclical which he  
 issued on the condemnation of Theodore of Cæsarea, he de-  
 clares his motive to have been the desire of peaceful unity,  
 "For the last five years," he says, addressing the obstinate  
 Acephalus, "we have shown our patience, granted us by the  
 divine favor, both to you and to those who have been se-  
 duced by you. First indeed, when, in order to repress scan-  
 dal, we condescended to the wishes of certain parties, whose  
 minds we thought might be pacified by some arrangement  
 (2), and whom you had been exciting for many years. We  
 thought to order some things medicinally for a time, but  
 under the condition that, all disturbance being quelled, no  
 one should hereafter, either by word or letter, presume to  
 touch the matter." But Vigilus had hoped in vain. The  
 Africans, Illyrians, Dalmatians, and others, persisted in de-

(1) *Councils of Gaul*, v. 1, p. 294.(2) The text has "*dispensatione*."

fending the Chapters, and even two deacons of the Roman Church, Rusticus and Sebastian, accused the Pontiff of despising the Council of Chalcedon. Vigilius therefore withdrew his *Judicatum*, and ordered all discussion of the Chapters to be avoided until a General Council could be assembled. This we are told in the epistle of the Italian clergy already cited: "Although the Africans, Illyrian, and Dalmatians did not acquiesce in the Pope's action, nevertheless Vigilius was soon urged again to condemn the Chapters, without any mention whatever of the Council of Chalcedon. But he was unwilling to do this, and saying that he was pressed too strongly, he told the most serene prince that there should come bishops from all the provinces, five or six from each, and that after a tranquil discussion the affair should be peacefully arranged, because, without the consent of all, he could not acquiesce in what called the Synod of Chalcedon into question and caused scandal in his brethren." It is no wonder that the Pope refused to attend the Council. Not only were there scarcely any Western prelates present, but the votes of the bishops were not free. We learn from Liberatus (1) that bribes were given and accepted; that those who refused to condemn the Chapters were deposed and exiled, and that many fled for safety. When, however, Vigilius perceived that the Council would certainly condemn the Chapters, he feared still more for the peace of the Church, and issued his *Constitutum*, in which he contended for the sparing of the persons, at least, of those in question. But in this document he launched no anathema against those who disagreed with him. Finally, he confirmed the Fifth Council, and decreed anathema against those who would hereafter defend the Chapters. This he did "after an investigation of the truth, and the Lord revealing." He saw that the Nestorians greatly abused the Chapters, and he knew that the Western bishops, with few exceptions, would obey his decree, even though their prejudices were hurt. In fine, the time had come to settle forever a question which was a continual menace to the peace of Christendom. If it is a mark of in-

(1) *Breviary*, c. 24.

constancy to act with prudence, and to change when one's better knowledge demands such a course, then Vigilius was fickle, and with him St. Augustine and many other great men who deemed such a proceeding eminently proper.

In his search for facts to support the theory of the supremacy of a General Council, Bossuet (1) seizes upon those we have narrated, and asserts that they manifest a belief in that theory, on the part of both Vigilius and the Fifth Council. That this conclusion is not warranted by the facts, is easily shown. When Justinian was urging, with all his power, the bishops of the Council to condemn the Chapters, his prime argument was the example of the Pontiff. But if the Council regarded itself as superior to the Pope, why did the emperor use such an argument? Again, Vigilius showed his authority over the Council, when, having promised Justinian to give his opinion within twenty days, he ordered, through the deacon Pelagius, the assembled prelates to decide nothing: "Keeping the ancient and regular order of things, not to attempt to utter anything before the promulgation of our, that is, the Apostolic See's sentence, lest there should again arise occasion for the trouble which has been allayed." This language is not that of an inferior. And so far was it from the mind of the Council to establish anything contrary to the will of the Pontiff, that the fathers rather allege his example as their reason for condemning the Chapters. In the seventh session, Justinian insisted that Vigilius was favorable to the condemnation, and while he carefully withheld the *Constitutum*, which would have proved the contrary, he ordered Constantine, questor of the palace, to read several epistles of the Pope which appeared to be of that tenor. Hence, in the eighth session, the Council condemned the obnoxious Chapters, and "because," say the bishops, "it has happened that the most religious Vigilius, now residing in this imperial city, has been present at all that was done about these Three Chapters, and has frequently condemned them, both in writing and without writing." Finally, Vigilius did not regard the Fifth Council as canonical; much less then

(1) *Defence of the Declaration*, p. 2, b. 12, c. 20.

did he deem it his superior. When the patriarch Eutychius requested him to come to the Council, he replied, as we read in the *Acts* of the first session, that it was his pleasure that the controversy should be discussed "in a canonical Synod," for he regarded the absence of the Western prelates as militating against its universality. And he not only refused to attend, but in the *Constitutum* so carefully suppressed by Justinian, he declared its acts null and void. Even when he decided to confirm the condemnation of the Chapters, he showed that he regarded the Synod as of no value until it received his approbation. For he says, "Those things have been safely carried out, which had to be defined by us, through the revelation of the Lord, and an investigation of the truth." He does not even style the assembly a Synod, but defines those as his "brethren and co-priests" who, holding the faith of the four General Councils, condemn the Three Chapters. The reader will also observe that it was only by the exertions of Pope Pelagius II. and St. Gregory the Great that the Fifth Council was received in the West; so far was the Gallican theory from the mind of the sixth century.

When treating of the heresies of the first three centuries, we omitted, out of respect to his name, and because it is by no means sure that he erred in faith, to say anything of Origen. But if there ever was a man who should have prayed to be delivered from his friends, he was one. His disciples were so obstinate in upholding whatever he said, and were so persistent in quoting him as a teacher of their vagaries, that, especially since most of his works are lost, he must bear a brunt perhaps undeserved. We allude to Origen, because the Fifth General Council condemned a sect of heretics who rejoiced in his name. The Origenists appealed to the great master's writings when they contended that Jesus Christ was only the adoptive Son of God; that human souls exist before their union with bodies; that the pains of hell are not eternal; that even Satan and his fellows will one day be freed from punishment. The decree of the Fifth Council on Origenism was specially directed against certain monks of Egypt and Palestine. Catholic

authors are not unanimous with regard to it. **Alexandre** strenuously contends that Origen was proscribed by the Fifth Synod (1), while the erudite Garnier (2) thinks that the proscription occurred in a Synod held five years previously by the patriarch Menna, and which is sometimes styled by old writers "the Fifth Council." The Origenists of whom we have spoken must not be confounded with an impure sect bearing the same name, founded by another and little known Origen. This sect condemned marriage, and allowed the grossest immoralities. Sts. Epiphanius and Augustine agree that the great Origen cannot be blamed for these teachings, as his works are remarkable for the praise of chastity.

---

## CHAPTER XXXII.

### PONTIFICATE OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT.

Gregory was born at Rome about the year 540, of a patrician family noted for its sterling worth and eminent piety. Possessed of great wealth, he used it entirely for the glory of God and the good of humanity. In Sicily he constructed and endowed six monasteries, and in Rome he built the celebrated one of St. Andrew (on the Cælian hill), which now belongs to the Camaldulense congregation of the Benedictine order. To this last establishment, having resigned the prefectship of the city in 573, Gregory retired for that study and religious contemplation so admirably promoted by the monastic life. Baronio contends that the future Pontiff entered the institute of St. Equitias, but the arguments of Dom. Mabillon (3), proving that the Benedictines rightly claim him as a companion, seem conclusive. Gregory was not long permitted to remain in the seclusion he dearly loved; Pope Pelagius II. drew him from his cell in the year 582, made him a deacon of Roman Church, and sent him

(1) *Third Century*, diss. 16.

(2) In his edition of the *Breviary* of Liberatus.

(3) *Preface to 1st Benedictine Century*, and the special dissertation on the *Monastic Life of St. Gregory the Great*.

as legate to Constantinople. During the five years of his embassy, he won the love and respect of the emperors Tiberius II. and Mauritius, while scrupulously discharging his duty as Papal representative (1). Recalled to Rome in 585, he begged permission to retire to his monastery, and it was accorded. But the plague of 590 having removed Pope Pelagius, the eyes of all fell upon the learned and holy monk as his successor. Elected to the Pontificate by the unanimous voice of the clergy, amid the joyful acclamations of the Senate and the people, he not only endeavored, by every means in his power, to induce the emperor Mauritius not to confirm the election (2), but betook himself to a hiding-place, that he might escape the honor. But the emperor immediately issued the confirmation, and his retreat having been discovered, the reluctant Gregory was consecrated on the 3rd of September.

We can only give a glance at this wonderful Pontificate, during which, for fourteen years, Gregory labored as few, even of the Popes, have labored. One of his first endeavors was to recall to the unity of the Church the defenders of the Three Chapters (3); he called them to a Synod, that their doubts might be solved, but they begged for delay, and Mauritius asked him not to molest them, on account of the terrible state to which northern Italy was reduced by the incursions of the Lombards. The Pontiff accorded the delay, but he exerted his influence successfully in preventing Theodelinda, the Lombard queen, from joining the schismatics. He then turned his attention to Africa, where the Donatists were again causing trouble. By energetic letters to the bishops of Numidia, he excited their zeal for the true faith. In epistles to the bishops of Arles and Marseilles, he prohibited the enforced baptism of Jews. A controversy having arisen in Spain as to the triple immersion, he approved both methods. He ordered that, in the island of Sardinia, where bishops were few, priests should confirm, in

(1) He converted the patriarch Eutychius, who had grievously erred in the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.

(2) This confirmation of a Pontifical election, in consideration of a certain sum of money, was the result of a usurpation by the Gothic kings, and had been retained by the emperor Justinian. It was finally abolished by Constantine Pogonatus (668-685).

(3) The bishops of Istria, headed by Severus of Aquileia.

cases of necessity. He decreed that the married subdeacons of Sicily should not be advanced in orders. He turned his energies to the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, but of that we shall treat in a special chapter.

One of the most interesting of Gregory's epistles was occasioned by the growing ambition of the see of Constantinople. The patriarch John "the Faster" having assumed the style of "œcumenical," the Pontiff wrote to him a stern, but prudent letter, in which occur the following passages: "I fear the hidden judgments of God, when I learn that the most holy John, a man of such abstinence and humility, has, through the seduction of his familiars, developed so much pride, that he tries to be like unto him who, arrogantly wishing to be like unto God, lost even the granted similarity. Certainly, the Apostle Peter is the first member of the holy universal Church; what are Paul, Andrew, John, but the chiefs of particular peoples? Under one head, all are members of the Church. . . . let your Holiness acknowledge, how much he must be inflated, who desires to be called by a name which no one, who was truly holy, presumed to assume. Were not the bishops of this Apostolic See, as your Fraternity knows, styled 'Universal' by the venerable Council of Chalcedon? And yet no one of them chose to be so designated, not one claimed the arrogant title." Indeed, so great was the delicacy of St. Gregory on this subject of titles, that he instituted the custom of the Pontiff's styling himself "Servant of the servants of God" (1).

St. Gregory was especially careful in the appointment of bishops. Among many instances which could be cited of this prudence, we select the following: John the Deacon had been chosen for the see of Naples, but the Pontiff rejected his name, because he had an infant daughter, thus proving that his continence was not of long duration. When three candidates were presented for the see of Ancona, he said of the first, "He is indeed learned in scripture, but he is broken with age;" of the second, "He is very watchful, but we hear that he does not know the Psalms;" and of the

(1) JOHN THE DEACON; b. 4, c. 58.

third, "We know him to be energetic, but what he is interiorly, we know not."

Hearing that simony was prevalent in Gaul and Germany, the saint wrote to queen Brunichilda (1), "Let your Christianity diligently watch, lest in your kingdom any one be allowed to receive Holy Orders, on account of money gifts, personal patronage, or claim of kinship; but let him be chosen for the episcopacy, or for any other holy office, whose life and morals proclaim him worthy; for if the honor of the priesthood is sold, that simoniacal heresy, which was the first to arise in the Church, and was condemned by Peter, will revive, which God forbid, to the detriment of the strength of your kingdom." In a Roman Synod, he prohibited the giving of money, either for ordination, or for the pallium. And writing to Theodobert, king of the Franks, he says that one of the effects of simony is that "the good, if poor, are despised and prohibited to receive Orders. And while the innocence of the poor man is displeasing, the bribe doubtless recommends the wicked; for where gold is liked, so is vice."

St. Gregory manifested great interest in liturgical matters. He added to the Canon of the Mass the words, "And dispense our days in Thy peace, and deliver us from eternal damnation, and order us to be numbered in the flock of Thy elect." He decreed that the Lord's Prayer should be recited after the Canon; that the Kyrie should be sung; that the Alleluja should not be restricted to the Paschal time; that the subdeacon should assist at Mass in alb only. He instituted that majestic chant which, after him, we term the Gregorian. He was very solicitous about the Stations at the basilicas and the catacombs, and it was while performing this devotion that he delivered his twenty Homilies on the Gospels. So great, however, was his humility, that he would not permit his writings to be read in the Vigils and other nocturnal Offices. He says (2), "I was not pleased when my brother and fellow-bishop, Marinian, caused the *Comments on Job* to be publicly read in the Vigils, because that work is not for the people, and might do more harm

(1) *Epist.* 5, b. 7.

(2) *Book X., epist.* 22.

than good to the uninstructed. But tell him to have read at the Vigils the *Comments on the Psalms*, which will teach morality to the secular mind. Nor do I wish that what I have happened to write, should be known to men while I am in the flesh. For I was much displeased when the deacon Anatolius, of blessed memory, obeyed the command of our lord the emperor, and gave him the book of *Pastoral Rule*, which my holy brother and fellow-bishop, Anastasius of Antioch, translated into the Greek language, and which, as was written to me, pleased him greatly. But it displeased me much, that they who have better books, should occupy themselves with unimportant ones." So far as he could prevent it, he would not allow his works to be read at the meals of his fellow-bishops. He writes to the bishop of Syracuse (1), "I hear that your Fraternity causes to be read at the table certain of my writings, and before strangers; this, it appears to me, ought not to be done, for some might impute to my vain glory, that which you do out of good feeling. Therefore, before visitors, let the sayings of the ancients be read, that the hearers may derive information from their authority."

In his intercourse with the emperor, Gregory always showed the respect due the civil authority, but he never, for a moment, forgot his own Apostolic duties. Events were already gradually precipitating a crisis which was soon to result in the introduction of the Pontiffs among the temporal sovereigns of the world, and the cares of civil administration were frequently forced upon Gregory. But as yet the Byzantine emperors were not so cruelly neglectful of the welfare, and even life, of their Roman subjects, as to force these to disclaim allegiance. The spirit of discontent, however, was developing itself, and hence our Pontiff was careful to show an example of respect to the imperial authority. When Mauritius promulgated a law, prohibiting admission to the ranks of the clergy or to the monastic life, of any persons owing service to the government; also ordering the monasteries to receive no soldiers or officers, Gregory approved of the first clause, but thought it should

(1) *Book VI., epist. 9.*

be so modified as to allow monasteries to receive those whose obligations they were willing to assume to themselves. As for the second clause, the Pontiff condemned it, and begged the emperor to abrogate it. "This Constitution," he says to Mauritius (1), "I tell my lord, has greatly astounded me, because by it the way to Heaven is closed to many, and what was till now permitted, is now prohibited. There are many who can lead a religious life, even when clad in the secular habit; but there are many who cannot be saved before God, unless they leave all things. Saying these things to my lord, what am I but dust and a worm? Yet, since I know that this Constitution is averse to God, the Author of all, I cannot remain silent before my lord. For power has been given by Heaven to the piety of my lord, over all men, in order that they may be aided who seek good things, in order that the way of Heaven may be made wider, in order that the earthly may be joined to the Heavenly kingdom. And behold, it is openly declared, that if a man has been once enrolled among the earthly soldiery, he cannot combat for our Lord Jesus Christ, unless his term has expired, or he is discharged for bodily infirmity. For these things, Christ will answer, through me, His and your most humble servant, saying: 'From a notary, I made you commander of the guards; from a commander's position, I raised you to that of Cæsar; from the station of Cæsar, I made you emperor; more than this, you are the father of emperors. I committed my priests into your hands, and you withdraw your soldiers from my service? . . . . . Hence, by that same terrible Judge, I pray that all the tears, the prayers, alms, and fastings of my lord may not become obscured before the eyes of God omnipotent; but that your Piety, either by change or by modification, may temper the rigor of this law, for the army of my lord grows in strength against the enemy, in proportion as the army of God grows in prayer.'" Having satisfied his conscience by this protest, Gregory promulgated the imperial mandate; but, in his letters to the metropolitans, he undertook to modify the obnoxious clause—nor was Mauri-

(1) *Book 2, epist. 62.*

tius offended thereby—by ordering that soldiers should not readily be admitted as monks, and only after a three years' probation in the secular habit.

The Roman Pontiff, as we have said, was not yet, in the time of St. Gregory, a temporal sovereign, but we find him setting an example to all bishops, as to the protection they should, if possible, afford their flocks, when the ordinary civil authorities are too negligent or too impotent to extend it. Thus, he sent Leontius to the Nepesines as governor, giving him these credentials (1): "We have given to Leontius the care and responsibility of the city, that, watching over all which turns to your utility, and that of the State, he may arrange, &c. Whoever resists his orders, will be known as contradicting our dispositions." He sent as governor to Naples, the tribune Constantius, with orders to protect it. Writing to the Neapolitan soldiery, the Pope says (2): "Among other merits of an army, it deserves the greatest praise when it shows obedience to the necessities of the State, as we learn your devotion has done, showing a fitting example of military obedience by respecting our epistles, whereby we deputed the honorable tribune Constantius as governor of the city." He wrote to the bishop of Terracina that not even the clergy should be exempted from sentry duty (3): "Since we have heard that many excuse themselves from the watch on the walls, let your Fraternity be careful that no one be exempted from this duty, either in our name or that of the Church." St. Gregory having suggested to Mauritius the propriety of making peace with the Lombards, he was regarded as a simpleton, and received rather insolent letters from the emperor. In his reply, we note the following passages (4): "Since I am denounced as a simpleton, as having been deceived by the cunning of Arnulph, I am doubtless regarded as a fool; and that I am such, I myself avow. For had I not been a fool, I would not have come to bear the things which I suffer in this place, from the swords of the Lombards. As for my saying that Arnulph was heartily willing to come to terms with the State, I am

(1) *Book VIII., epist. 2.*

(2) *Book XII., epist. 24.*

(3) *Book VII., epist. 20.*

(4) *Book 4, epist. 31.*

upbraided as a liar. But although I am not a (good) priest, I know it is a grave injury to a priest, if, when serving the truth, he is thought to be a deceiver. . . . . And truly, if the captivity of my country were not momentarily becoming more intolerable, I would gladly be silent as to the contempt shown to me. But this greatly afflicts me, that what causes me to be charged with falsehood, also causes Italy to lie captive under the yoke of the Lombards. And while my suggestions are ignored, the forces of the enemy immensely increase. . . . . What wonder is it if your Piety deigns to honor those whom God Himself calls gods and angels? . . . what wonder if a Christian emperor deigns to honor the priests of the true God, when Pagan princes knew how to honor those priests who served gods of wood and stone? I suggest these things to the piety of my lord, not on my own account, but because of the entire priesthood; as for myself, I am a sinful man." At one time, St Gregory had made peace with the Lombards, but owing to the imprudence of Mauritius, war again ensued, and king Agilulph invaded the Duchy of Rome, took a large number of captives, and laid siege to the city. While the siege lasted, the imperial prefect and the general commanding were not more active in the defence than the Pontiff, but Mauritius, instead of thanking him, upbraided him because there had not been more corn in the city. The saint, nevertheless, had used the treasures of the Church to pay the soldiery, and to ransom the captive Romans (1). In an epistle to the emperor already quoted (2), the Pontiff says, "I had already received several wounds, when the arrival of my lord's orders brought me unhopd-for consolations. If I can, I shall enumerate these wounds. The first was when the peace, which, without any detriment to the state, I had made with the Lombards of Tuscany, was broken; again, when the garrison was withdrawn from Rome. Many of them had indeed been killed by the enemy, the rest were stationed in Narni and Perugia; that Perugia might be held, Rome was abandoned. After this, a more severe wound was caused by the coming of Agilulph, when, with my own eyes, I saw the

(1) *Book 4, epist. 34.*(2) *Ibi, epist. 31.*

Romans with ropes around their necks, like dogs, led off to be sold in Gaul. And as for us who, by the mercy of God, remained safe from the enemy, we have been called culpable because the corn gave out, when we could not possibly have collected more. I have not been disturbed hereby for myself, because I speak from my conscience when I declare myself ready for anything, provided only I issue forth from these troubles with the salvation of my soul. But I have been greatly afflicted on account of the glorious heroes, the prefect Gregory, and the general, Castor, who, to the utmost of their ability, neglected nothing, but suffered greatly in the defence of the city; and yet they have fallen under the displeasure of my lord. But I plainly understand that it is not their conduct, but my person, that causes their trouble." At length, St. Gregory saw peace concluded with Agilulph, and on that score, his last days were happy.

That our Pontiff was a most learned, as well as a most holy man, his works, and the estimation in which they have ever been held, abundantly prove. He was unacquainted with Greek, according to his own acknowledgment (1); but this does not appear to have been much of a drawback. Our limits will permit of only a cursory glance at his works. His book of *Morals*, deduced from Job, was written at the instance of St. Leander of Spain, while our saint was Papal legate at Constantinople; it is admirably adapted to the wants of the preacher, and to him who seeks guidance in the care of souls. The *Pastoral Book* was occasioned by a reproof given the saint by John, archbishop of Ravenna, for having refused a bishopric. It fully treats of the duties of bishops, and was so highly appreciated during the middle ages, that we find many Synods enjoining its study and observance upon bishops. Thus, the Council of Tours, in 813, declares that every bishop should look at himself in it, as in a mirror. The *Homilies on Ezechiel* were delivered to the people, and taken down by notaries; the forty *Homilies on the Gospels* were some delivered by himself, and others dictated to notaries who read them to the people. Certain authors, both Catholic and Protestant, have denied that St.

(1) "We have written no work in Greek, nor do we know Greek." *Book 6, epist. 29.*

Gregory is the author of the *Dialogues* ascribed to him, but the weight of evidence is for the affirmative side of the question (1). The *Antiphonary* is a new arrangement of the ancient Antiphons of the Church, with the addition of many new ones. The *Sacramentary* is based on the codex of Pope Gelasius, and has been greatly modified by succeeding Pontiffs. There are *Commentaries* on the *Book of Kings*, on the *Penitential Psalms*, and on the *Cantic of Canticles*, attributed to St. Gregory, which seem to be unauthentic (2).

Modern incredulists, and other adversaries of the Holy See, have accused St. Gregory of virulent hostility to profane science, alleging that he forbade the study of letters to ecclesiastics; that his fanaticism caused him to procure the destruction of many monuments of Pagan Rome; that he burned the valuable library of the Palatine; that he was, in fine, the Attila of literature. As for the Pontiff's sentiments in regard to letters, John the Deacon (3) tells us that, under Gregory's rule, wisdom built for herself at Rome a visible temple, and that the halls of the Papal palace were resplendent with the glories of the seven arts; that not one of the court, from the highest to the lowest, ever betrayed the least barbarism in language or in dress; that study of the fine arts was the order of the day. The works of St. Gregory show that he was a learned man, and if, as is alleged, he sometimes appears to condemn the adventitious beauties of rhetoric (4), it is only because, as he himself tells us, he was more concerned for purity of doctrine and for exactness in dogmatic expression. He certainly did reprove a bishop for teaching rhetoric (5), but merely because he deemed the office of pedagogue beneath the episcopal dignity. And is it likely that a fanatical devotee of ignorance would have occupied the position of prefect of Rome, or that he would have been made legate to the cultivated court of Constantinople? Brucker (6) asserts that our Pontiff

(1) See ALEXANDRE; *Cent.* 6, chap. 4, art. 16. (2) *Ibi.*

(3) *Life of St. Gregory*, b. 2, c. 12. (4) *Epistle to Leander*, prefixed to the *Morals*.

(5) *Epist.* 54, to *Desiderius of Vienne*.

(6) *Critical History of Philosophy*, v. 3, p. 2, b. 2. "Among the many merits of this writer, to whom we owe the fullest, most complete, and most profound, history of philosophy yet seen, is that of wise moderation; he does not, like many Protestants, exercise a rabid fury towards everything Catholic. But on this occasion, he seems to have forgotten his wise impartiality. . . . . In the appendix he asserts that this otherwise good bishop

expelled mathematicians from his palace, and that he burned the Palatine library. Bayle and Barbeyrac, hostile though they are to the Fathers, admit that the last accusation is baseless. It is founded solely upon the authority of John of Salisbury (d. 1180), who, in his *Polycraticon*, b. 2, c. 26, says that, "The most holy doctor, Gregory, who nourished and inebriated the whole Church with the honeyed rain of his preaching, not only ordered mathematicians to retire from his court, but, as is handed down from our forefathers, gave to the flames all the writings contained in the (library of) Palatine Apollo, among which the principal were thought to reveal to men the celestial mind, and the oracles of Heaven." But how is it that for more than five hundred years we find no mention of this accusation? Brucker answers that it was a tradition, "handed down from our forefathers," in the words of John of Salisbury, and that Catholics, who rely so much upon tradition, ought therefore to accept it. But Catholics, well replies Bergier (1), do not receive as tradition every hearsay, and Protestants, who reject even written traditions, ought not to accept one which is unwritten. Let us omit, however, for the moment, any question as to the authority of John of Salisbury. What does he assert? Firstly, that St. Gregory expelled mathematicians from his court. But who were these "mathematicians?" In the middle ages this term was principally applied to judicial astrologists, that is, to those who pretended to predict the future by a planetary investigation. Brucker and his imitators may have been grossly ignorant as to the literature of that time, but certainly they should have noticed that Salisbury himself informs us that he makes no reference to "mathematicians" in our sense of the word. He is attacking the false science of astrology, and alleges the authority of "the most holy doctor, Gregory," who, he says, not only banished the impostors from

was not naturally acute, that he possessed no force of genius, and could not reason well. But while he was thus writing, there fell into his hands two books written in defence of St. Gregory, one by a Benedictine monk of Frisingen, and the other by the anonymous French author of the *History of Eclecticism*. Hence he resolved to again enter the field, and in a long, and, if I may so speak, very tedious digression of full forty pages, he undertook to refute the arguments of these writers, and to develop or confirm his previous assertions of our Pontiff's superstition, ignorance, and want of discernment." TIRABOSCHI; *Italian Literature*, b. 2, c. 2.

(1) *Dictionary*, art. *Gregory*.

his presence, but even destroyed those writings "which were thought to reveal to men the celestial mind, and the oracles of Heaven."

As for the burning of the grand Library constructed by Augustus in the Palatine temple of Apollo (1), could such an event, so interesting to every votary of learning, have taken place, we will not say, without the lamentations of many, but without even a word of comment? And nevertheless, five centuries and a half elapse, during which a constant succession of chroniclers are busily recording even the trivialties of their time, and not a suspicion of such an event is hinted. The authority of John of Salisbury is not so incontestable as to justify us in yielding to his uncorroborated assertion, and in the face of this eloquent silence. Brucker praises his virtues, and tells us they procured his elevation to the see of Chartres. But virtue does not necessarily imply the power of critical discernment, and when Salisbury narrates things displeasing to Protestant ears, we hear nothing either of his virtue or of his acumen. The fact is, however, John of Salisbury was a bad critic; everything was grist to his mill. In the course of his works, many popular traditions are met, some of them simply ridiculous, and yet he approves them all. Coming from the pen of a Catholic bishop, what can be more absurd than his approval (2) of the story of Trajan's pardon from hell, thanks to the importunate prayers of Pope Gregory, "but only on condition that Gregory should never again intercede with God for an infidel"? But perhaps the strongest refutation of this calumny can be found in the evident futility of the act with the commission of which our Pontiff is charged. If St. Gregory burned the Palatine Library, he did so through false zeal for sacred letters. Now that zeal could not be satisfied by the destruction of one single library, and he would have in vain brought opprobrium upon himself. In Rome there were many other such collections, and in the monasteries of Italy, Gaul, Ireland, and Spain, the patient scribes were constantly multiplying copies of the dangerous classics.

(1) Some authors have thought that Salisbury intended to refer merely to the destruction of the astrological books, but the tenor of the passage seems to imply a burning of the entire collection.

(2) *Polycraticon*, b. 5, c. 8.

The Roman Pontiff who would be so foolish and reckless as to burn the Palatine Library, would certainly have ordered the destruction of the classics in every monastery of the world (1).

St. Gregory is also charged with the destruction of many monuments of ancient Roman magnificence. But upon what testimony is this accusation put forth? Upon that of Amalricus, who lived in the 14th century, and whom the erudite and critical Muratori regards as a swallower of fables; upon that of Leo Urbevetanus, also of the 14th century, and whom Lamy accuses of credulity; upon that of Raphael of Volaterra, of the 16th century, whom Tiraboschi condemns as of little reliability (2). Where did these writers, of a period eight and nine centuries posterior to the age of Greg-

(1) Some writers of the 15th century asserted that St. Gregory endeavored to prevent the study of Tally and Livy. This seems unlikely, for these authors are probably the least offensive of any on the classic shelves. A condemnation of Horace, Catullus, and Tibullus, would have been much more consonant with the Pontiff's supposed severity. Tiraboschi (*loc. cit.*) speaks as follows of the authority of John of Salisbury: "Who is this writer? In the first place he lived six centuries after St. Gregory. Now some of the critics of our day conduct themselves, to tell the truth, in a very frivolous manner. They want every fact to be proved by the authority of writers contemporary, or nearly so, with the events in question, and if they come across a narration by a modern author, unaccompanied by such authoritative proof, they either reject the fact narrated, or place it on the list of doubtful events. I myself believe in so doing, but these gentlemen are not consistent. When they meet a story which, for some reason, they wish to credit, then any testimony, no matter of how distant an authority, is sufficient. Were John of Salisbury to narrate something creditable to St. Gregory, then we would hear that he is unreliable, but if he tells us something that would indicate the saint as a fanatic and an ignorant man, then he is a truth-telling and critical historian. . . . No other writer, during the space of nearly six centuries, says anything about St. Gregory's having burnt a library; at length an English author speaks of it, but gives no proof. Why should we easily believe him? And here precisely has Brucker been awaiting us. No, says he, Salisbury does not allege this fact without good proof (*Appendix*, p. 659); he says that 'it is handed down to us *a majoribus*;' therefore it was a perpetual tradition, doubted by no one; it was probably recorded in many books not now extant; a wise and learned man, such as Salisbury was, would not have asserted it without reason. Thus proceeds Brucker in his lengthy demonstration. But let me ask Brucker if he believes it true that St. Gregory freed the soul of Trajan from hell. He must laugh at my question. But suppose that I declare that this act of the saint is narrated by a writer of the 12th century. He will answer that it was precisely in those times of ignorance that such fables originated; that a writer, who seriously records such things, is a weak-minded, superstitious, ignorant man. Very well. This John of Salisbury, that man, as Brucker says (*ibid.*), who was learned beyond his time; that most celebrated author who was greatly esteemed by the University of Paris (*ibid.*, p. 660); in whose writings there is not wanting critical acumen, and whom learned men set above all his contemporaries (p. 664); who, well instructed in dialectics was not so uncultured, as, like Gregory, to prefer to be accused of ignorance rather than acquire the art of reasoning properly; who under the tuition of the great professor of logic, William of Soissons, learned the elements of that science, and hence entered upon the right road of true erudition (p. 665); this very man, to whom Brucker gives all these praises, when he wishes us to credit the story of the Palatine library, narrates such a fact with the most admirable seriousness. . . . Does Brucker believe this tale? Let him then acknowledge that his John of Salisbury is not so critical as he would have us believe; that he narrates as certain things that common sense shows to have been impossible (and if time and space permitted, I could give many instances, for I have read the whole of Salisbury's book, in order to form an impartial judgment); that his 'it is said,' 'we read,' 'it is rumored,' indicate merely popular traditions that are without foundation. . . . Finally, in the two passages in which he speaks of this conflagration, John of Salisbury contradicts himself. In one place he says that the library given to the flames was that of the Capitol, in another, that it was that of the temple of the Palatine Apollo. It is certain that these were two different libraries, and they were very distant from each other."

(2) As critics, Muratori and Tiraboschi occupy a position second to none and immeasurably more eminent than that attained by the rank and file of the profession. Lamy's opinions are greatly respected by scholars.

ory, derive their information? In all the works composed during this interval, there is profound silence as to the imputed vandalism of our Pontiff; it is ignored by Gregory of Tours, Isidore of Spain, Ven. Bede, Liutprand, the deacons Paul and John, Anastasius the Librarian, all of whom are prolific with details of his reign. We are asked to believe that a Roman patrician, a member of a senatorial family, and a man of liberal education, one who had occupied the exalted pretorial chair over a people distinguished for their pride in their city, helped to consummate the work of devastation which the Northern barbarians had left incomplete. We are asked to ignore his lamentations, his overpowering grief (1), caused by the destruction of so many beautiful edifices, and to regard him as a prince of vandals. And how is his insanity explained? We are told that the fanatical Pontiff wished to remove from the Roman people any danger of relapse into idolatry. But in the time of St. Gregory the Great, the Romans were as far removed from any weakness of faith as they are to-day; perhaps, indeed, further removed than they are at present. While admiring the magnificent productions of ancestral genius, they were as free from any yearnings towards idolatry as any of their martyred forefathers. And would the Roman people have allowed this destruction of their city's glorious monuments? Procopius (2) (d. 565) says, "The Romans are more careful of their city than any people we know; everything belonging to their country they strive to preserve, and although they have suffered under the rule of barbarism, they have preserved the edifices of the city, and as many of its ornaments as they were able." Gregory was Supreme Pontiff, and had, as we have seen, almost royal power in the Roman Duchy, but the emperor was yet the acknowledged master. Would he have permitted this gross infraction of the Theodosian and Justinianic laws, which so strictly provided for the care of the ancient monuments? No emperor would have suffered such vandalism to be perpetrated, still less Mauritius, who was constantly at issue with our saint, and seized every oppor-

(1) *Homily 18, on Ezekiel.*(2) *Gothic War, b. 2.*

tunity to vex him (1). But we need no better defence of St. Gregory than is furnished by Rome at this day. When we look upon the great number of ancient monuments which, thanks to the fostering care and liberal expenditure of the Pope-Kings, yet subsist in the Eternal City, we must suppose that Gregory's successor did not gaze upon any traces of Papal vandalism. And we know that many of the ancient monuments have disappeared since the death of our Pontiff (2). Rome has withstood many vicissitudes during the last twelve hundred years. She has been sacked by the foreigner, and her treasures have been plundered by her own turbulent barons. Her Frangipani and Savelli have pulled to pieces many an ancient building to procure materials for a medieval fortress, and she has seen the Gallic invader weakening her admired masonries to provide metal for his cannon. And in spite of all this, the modern traveller is awestruck under the spell of her numerous monuments of ancient art. What, then, we would ask, must have been the extent and condition of these monuments, when Sabinian took possession of the Chair of Peter?

St. Gregory died in 604, the fourteenth year of his Pontificate. His eulogy may be well condensed in the words of St. Ildephonse of Toledo, "In holiness, he excelled Anthony; in eloquence, Cyprian; and in wisdom, Augustine" (3).

(1) Although not a tyrant, Mauritius caused much trouble to St. Gregory. Thus, he left his Italian subjects a prey to the Lombards, in spite of the Pontiff's assiduous prayers for their relief. He also sustained the arrogance of the Constantinopolitan patriarch in claiming the title of "Œcumenical." We have already noticed the obstacles he threw in the way of military men, aspiring to the monastic life. He aided in every way the defenders of the Three Chapters, and so protected Maximus, a Dalmatian schismatic, that he was enabled to ridicule the Papal authority.

(2) See Fea's *Dissertation on the Ruins of Rome*.

(3) *Ecclesiastical Writers*.

## CHAPTER XXXIII.

### THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND.

At the time of Christ's sojourn upon earth, Druidism was the religion of Britain; by whom, and when, the Gospel was first introduced into the island, is uncertain. Eusebius (1) says that the Apostles passed into Britain, and Gildas (2) seems to imply that the conversion took place under Tiberius. More modern authors have ventured to determine the name of the first Apostle of Britain. Parsons (3) contended that this glory belongs to St. Peter; Godwin (4) and Stillingfleet (5) ascribed it to St. Paul. Lingard (6) regards the arguments used by both Catholic and Protestant writers, in determining this question, as unworthy of attention. "The former," he says, "relied on the treacherous and hyperbolical expressions of a few more ancient writers." It is certain that Christianity first took firm root in Britain, about the year 182, in the reign of Lucius, the great-grandson of Caractacus, and heir of some of the authority given that prince by Claudius. At the solicitation of Lucius, Pope Eleutherius sent Fugatius and Damian to instruct the Britons, and a flourishing church soon came into existence. The controversies which were the bane of the East, did not disturb the less polished and less inquisitive islanders, but they were not destined to be never assailed by heresy. Their countryman, Pelagius, succeeded in propagating his errors to an alarming extent, and it was only by the zeal of St. Germain l'Auxerrois and St. Lupus of Troyes, that the orthodox faith was sustained (7). But another formidable enemy now con-

(1) *Dem. Evang.*, b. 1, c. 7.

(4) *First Conversion of Britain.*

(2) *Calamity, Destruction, and Conquest of Britain.* (5) *Brit. Orig.*

(3) *Three Conversions*, v. 1.

(6) *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, c. 1.

(7) Sts. Germain and Lupus received their mission, according to Constantius, from the bishops of Gaul; according to Prosper, from Pope Celestine. These prelates met the Pelagian leaders in a Synod at Verulam, and after a day's useless debate, nothing was decided, but in the evening a miracle confirmed the teachings of St. Germain, and his opponents declared themselves converted. But the heresy soon burst out anew, and the holy Auxerrois resumed his labors—this time with permanent success. See *Life of St. Germain*, by Constantius, b. 11, c. 1.

fronted the British church. The piratical Saxons, who, according to Ptolemy (Claude), had been, in the second century, a small tribe of barbarians in the Cimbrian Chersonesus, were now become a mighty power, and were dominant in the Germanic regions. The reader is doubtless familiar with the tale of the Saxon conquest of Britain. The natives resisted to the utmost, and the incensed invaders gave such vent to their fury, that the surviving Britons took refuge in the fastnesses of the western coast of the island. With them vanished civilization and Christianity; German barbarism and idolatry were conquerors (1). But wherever the fierce northern savage destroyed the worldly empire of Rome, he soon kneeled in adoration to the God of Rome. John the Deacon (2) gives us the following narration of the first steps towards the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons: "On a certain day, when many things were exposed for sale in the Roman Forum, and many persons had come there to buy, it chanced that Gregory, a man most worthy before God, passed along. Seeing for sale some youths of very fair complexion, of beautiful shape and charming features, and with shining hair, he asked the trader from what land he had brought them. He replied that they came from the island of Britain, the inhabitants of which all possessed similar brightness of countenance. Gregory asked whether the islanders were Christians, or still involved in the errors of Paganism; the merchant answered that they were not Christians, but yet held in Pagan chains. Then Gregory sighed heavily, and said, 'Alas! that the prince of darkness should possess such resplendent faces, and that such external beauty should be united to souls not bearing the interior grace of God!' Again he demanded the name of that people, and the merchant said that they were called 'Angles.' And he answered that they were well styled 'Angles,' as though they were 'Angels,' for they had angelic features, and should be fellow-citizens with the angels of Heaven." Impressed with this idea, Gregory besought Pope Benedict I. for permission to under-

(1) The ferocity displayed by the Saxons in this war was such that it would be incredible, if narrated only by the Briton Gildas, but the *Saxon Chronicle* corroborates his assertions.

(2) *Life of Pope St. Gregory the Great*, b. 1, c. 3. Venerable Bede gives the same account, b. 2, and says it was handed down as a "tradition of our ancestors." John the Deacon wrote in the 9th century, Bede in the 7th and 8th.

take the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons. He departed on his mission, but, says John the Deacon, "the Romans were displeased at his absence, and conspiring together, they approached the Pontiff in three separate crowds, as he was going to the Basilica of St. Peter, and shouted, 'Thou hast offended Peter; thou hast destroyed Rome, in dismissing Gregory.' " In consequence of this attitude of the Romans, the zealous monk was recalled to the city, and his subsequent election to the Papacy compelled him to entrust to others the accomplishment of his design. His first step in this direction was an epistle to Candidus, the administrator of the patrimony of St. Peter in Gaul, commissioning him to purchase a number of young Saxon slaves, to be sent to Rome, and there, if they proved fit, to be ordained, and sent as missionaries to their countrymen (1). The youths did not prove very bright, and the Pontiff turned to his quondam companions of the Cælian monastery for his instruments. Under the supervision of Augustine, a number of monks set out, bearing letters to the Gallic clergy, asking for interpreters to be assigned them, and also letters to the Frank princes, begging their protection on the way. They landed on the island of Thanet, in 597. We do not propose to describe the conversion of the Heptarchy; the reader will find the details in Lingard's apposite work, already cited, and from which we draw the material for this chapter.

In the entire history of Christianity, there is no instance of a change wrought in a converted people equal to that which the acceptance of the Gospel operated in the Anglo-Saxons. The various provinces of the old Roman Empire had long been subjected to the influences of a high civilization; these people were not merely barbarians, they were savages. When St. Patrick preached the faith to the Irish, he met a brave and sturdy, but yet a refined and gentle race. The Goths, Scythians, Lombards, and other barbaric nations, who entered the Christian fold, were endowed with sentiments of delicacy, if they are compared with the neophytes of St. Augustine. All the barbaric hordes who helped to disintegrate the great Empire, were valorous, but

(1) *Gregory's Epistles*, b. 5, No. 16.

the Saxons were simply brutal. Other tribes desired the labor of their captives; the Saxons preferred to drink ale out of their skulls. The Christian missionary expected to be obliged to combat the sensual passions of his converts, but, if we are to believe the ancient chroniclers, he must have been appalled by the lust of the Saxon. The brute creation is unanimous in its love for its offspring; the Saxons were so greedy of gold that they sold their own children to the slave-dealers of the continent. Their theology knew but one sin, cowardice; it recognized but one virtue, courage. But with the advent of Christianity, this terrible picture vanished, and the Saxon was no longer a monster. In a short time, he too took up the work of the apostolate, and St. Boniface converted the Old Saxons, Franks, Hessians, and Thuringians; St. Swibert the Westphalians; Sts. Wilfrid and Willibrord the Frisians and the Hollanders; St. Willihad the tribes north of the Elbe. Piety became a characteristic of the nation. Nowhere were churches, hospitals, and monasteries more numerous, or better endowed, and nowhere were they attended by a more devoted clergy; the land came to be styled the "Island of Saints." Religion developed civilization, or rather created it; the useful, as well as the agreeable, was cultivated, and the Saxon barbarian was soon to be found only in history.

Protestants once held that the Anglo-Saxon church was a Papistical institution from its very foundation. Bale informs us that "Augustine was first sent to initiate the Anglo-Saxons in Papistical traditions; he introduced altars, vestments, masses, images, &c." (1). The same author delicately asserts that Augustine "brought nothing but Pontifical traditions and human dung" (2). Parker says that Augustine was "an apostle to the Angles, not of the Christian faith and of the divine word, but of ceremonies and Roman rites; and he taught them to be Romans and Pontificals, rather than Christians and Evangelicals" (3). But more modern Saxon scholars have discovered that the early church of their ancestors was not "Pontifical," but rather

(1) *Cent.* 13, c. 1.

(2) *Cent.* 8, c. 85. The text has *stercora*.

(3) *Ant. Brit.*, p. 35.

worthy of being numbered among Protestant organizations. Athelhard, archbishop of Canterbury, having asked of the bishops assembled in the Synod of Cloveshoe (y. 803) for a Profession of Faith, they answered (1): "Let it be known to your Paternity, that we believe as was first taught by the Holy Roman and Apostolic See, by the direction of the most blessed Pope Gregory." Hence, according to these investigators. St. Gregory also was a Protestant. It is not difficult, however, to prove that the faith of the early Saxon Christians was what Parker called "Roman and Pontifical." In the first place, if the Saxon church was not united with the Roman in identity of doctrine, how can we account for the strict communion between the two churches? How is it that Boniface, Swibert, Wilfrid, and other Saxon missionaries preached the faith of Rome, among the German barbarians, and founded churches in communion with Rome? What mean the professions of submission to Rome, the innumerable acts of devotion to the Holy See, on the part of the Saxon kings? But let us examine the doctrines of the Saxon church, as indicated by its practices.

It is certain that the early Saxon Christians agreed with Rome as to the necessity of the Sacrament of Baptism. Protestants, however, frequently assert that the ceremonies of the Roman Ritual were unknown, that the insufflation and unctions with oil and chrism were not in use. Yet Bede (2) mentions the insufflation; the *Saxon Pontifical* (3), prescribes the salt; Archbishop Ælfric (4) speaks of the unction with oil on the breast and between the shoulders, and of that with chrism on the top of the head; Alcuin (5), finally, gives the ceremonies in their entirety. That the anointings with chrism were regarded as sacred, is shown by the head being kept bound with a fillet for seven days (6). The only difference between the practice of the ancient and that of the modern English Catholics, in the ceremonies attendant on Baptism, seems to have been in the old custom of giving the Eucharist to the lately baptized infant (7).

(1) WILKINS; *Councils*, p. 162. (4) *Saxon Laws*, p. 172.

(2) *B.* 5, c. 6.

(3) MARTENE, v. 1.

(5) *Treatise to Adrian in Duchesne's Alcuin*, part II.

(6) BEDE, b. 5, c. 7.

(7) *Saxon Laws*, p. 172

With regard to Confirmation, we know that the child was presented to the bishop, and that he received the gifts of wisdom and fortitude to assist him in the spiritual warfare(1). As for the doctrine of the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, Anglican authors, such as Parker, Lisle, Usher, Whelock, Hickes, Carte, Littleton, and Henry, have endeavored to show that Transubstantiation was not the belief of the Anglo-Saxons. Philology and history have been tirelessly invoked, but among all the Saxon authors who flourished during the brilliant period preceding the Danish inroads, not a passage can be found denying the Catholic doctrine; among the writers of the dark period which followed the Danish devastations, there are some expressions which Protestants eagerly seize, but which Catholics as eagerly defend. The first testimony to which we draw the reader's attention is from the *Actions* of the Synod of Calcuith (816). From the earliest days of the Church, no temple could be dedicated unless it held the remains of a martyr; hence, a small portion, at least, of a martyr's relics, were deposited in every altar-stone. In England, however, it became so difficult to observe this law, that the Synod of Calcuith (2) ordered that when relics could not be obtained, the Blessed Eucharist should be preserved in the church. And why? "Because the Eucharist is the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." But, replies the Protestant, such a disposition of the Eucharist does not necessarily imply a belief in Transubstantiation; the Saxons may have believed, as do some Protestants, that Christ is present at the act and time of Communion. The context shows that a permanent, abiding presence is understood; for, in the Protestant supposition, of what significance, more than any other substance, would be the Eucharistic host, in lieu of the martyr's relics? A permanent, not a transitory presence of our Lord is supposed by Bede (3) when he says, "When we celebrate the Mass, we again immolate to the Father the sacred Body and the precious Blood

(1) BEDE; *Life of Cuthbert*, c. 29 and 32. WILKINS; *Councils*, p. 252. *Saxon Laws*, p. 167.

(2) WILKINS; *Council of Calcuith*.

(3) *Homily on the Eve of the Passion*.

of the Lamb, with which we have been redeemed from our sins." Egbert, archbishop of York, who wrote in the beginning of the eighth century, compiled a *Pontifical*, which was preserved at Evreux; in the abbey of Iumiege, another Anglo-Saxon *Pontifical* was also extant in the time of Martene. From these two documents (1), we learn that at the ordination of a priest, he is endowed with the power of "transforming the Body and Blood of Christ." The pyx is called "the bearer of the Body of Christ," and a "new sepulchre for the Body of Christ." The *corporale* is "a piece of linen, on which the Body and Blood of Christ are consecrated, and in which they are wrapped up." The altar is declared to be consecrated in order that on it "a sacred virtue may turn the creatures chosen for sacrifice into the Body and Blood of the Redeemer, and transform them by an invisible change, into the Sacred Hosts of the Lamb, that as the Word was made flesh, so the nature of the offering being blessed, *may be elevated to the substance of the Word, and what before was food, may here be made eternal life.*"

Among the works of the Saxon clergy which were composed after the Danish invasion, we find some translations and several sermons by Ælfric, a monk who had studied in the school of St. Ethelwold at Winchester, and who finally became archbishop of Canterbury. In treating of the Eucharist, Ælfric teaches that "the Eucharistic differs from the natural Body of Christ," and that "the former is indeed His Body, but after a spiritual, not after a bodily manner" (2). Lisle, Usher, Henry, and other Protestant writers, interpret this doctrine in their own favor, but Catholic disputants, and none better than Lingard (3), show that it is thoroughly consistent with Catholic orthodoxy. Among the many questions which the medieval scholastics delighted in raising, occurs, whether wisely or not, it is not for us to determine, one speculating upon the precise nature of Christ's Eucharistic Body. Haimo of Halberstadt held that, as a sign is excluded by reality, so the Eucharist contained no mystery or sign. Paschasius, Hincmar, and

(1) MARTENE: *Ancient Rites* (y. 1700).

(2) *Sermon for Easter.*

(3) *Antiquities*, note N.

others, admitted both sign and reality, and added that the Eucharistic Body was the identical one which was born of Mary and suffered on the cross. A third school, represented by Ratramn or Bertram, a monk of Corbie, and Ælfric (1), rejected both the former opinions, and taught a triple distinction of the Body of Christ: viz., that born of Mary, the Eucharistic, and the mystical. Rabanus Maurus, archbishop of Mentz (2), one of this school, declares that the difference for which they disputed, was merely as to the external appearance; and Bertram, though trying to show that the natural is not the same as the Eucharistic Body, plainly admits their identity, when he says that Christ "changed the substance of bread into His own Body, which was about to suffer, and the creature of wine into his own Blood, which was to be shed on the cross." As to Ælfric's belief in the Real Presence, it is clearly indicated in his Sermon on the Sacrifice of the Mass, although Henry asserts that no ingenuity can reconcile his doctrine with that of Rome (3). The reader shall judge whether the Saxon prelate's notions upon the nature of the Sacramental Body imply denial of Transubstantiation, and whether his doctrine should be pleasing to Protestants. We give Lingard's translation; the Saxon text may be found in Lisle's edition of 1623 (4). "Much is there between the invisible might of the holy husel, and the visible appearance of its own kind. In its own kind, it is corruptible bread and corruptible wine; but, after the might of the divine word, it is truly Christ's Body and His Blood, not indeed, in a bodily, but in a ghostly manner. Much is there between the Body, in which Christ suffered, and the Body which is hallowed to husel. Truly the Body in which Christ suffered, was born of the flesh of Mary, with blood and with bone, and with skin and with sinews, in human limbs, and with a reasonable living soul. But His ghostly Body, which we call the husel, is gathered of many corns, without blood and bone, without limbs and a

(1) The Danish devastations had seriously affected the monasteries, and when, in the 10th century, St. Dunstan restored monachism in England, he was forced to import instructors from French establishments. Monks of Fleury and Corbie taught at Abingdon and Winchester, and there Ælfric received the ideas of Bertram.

(2) MABILLON; *Cent.* 4, v. 2.

(3) *History*, v. 2, p. 202.

(4) Also, see Whelock's *Bede*.

soul, and therefore nothing is to be understood in it after a bodily, but after a ghostly manner. Whatever there is in the husel, which giveth us the substance of life, that cometh of the ghostly might and invisible operation. For this reason the holy husel is called a Sacrament; because one thing is seen in it, and another understood. That which is seen, hath a bodily appearance; that which we understand, hath a ghostly might. Certainly, Christ's Body that suffered death, and arose from death, dies now no more; it is eternal and impassible. The husel is temporal, not eternal; corruptible, dealed into pieces, chewed between the teeth, and sent into the stomach. But it is nevertheless all in every part according to the ghostly might. Many receive the holy Body, but it is nevertheless all in every part according to the ghostly Sacrament. Though some men receive a smaller part, yet there is not more might in a greater part than in a smaller. Because it is entire in all men, according to the invisible might. This Sacrament is a pledge and a figure; Christ's Body is truth. This pledge we hold sacramentally, till we come to the truth, and then this pledge will end. Truly it is, as we said before, Christ's Body and His Blood, not after a bodily, but after a ghostly manner. Nor shall ye search how it is made so; but hold that it is made so." Had Ælfric been surrounded by heretics, by men who denied the real and permanent Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, his expressions would doubtless have been more guarded, and he would have perhaps paid more attention to his own injunction at the close of the cited passage. However, in these words there is no source of comfort to a Protestant (1). All Catholics admit that in the Eucharist the Body of Christ does not exist after the manner of an ordinary, natural body, and some adjectives must be employed to express the different modes of existence. Bertram, Ælfric, and others used the terms "naturally" and "spiritually;" the Council of Trent adopted the words "naturally" and

(1) We should observe that, immediately after the above passage, Ælfric, as a proof of the Real Presence, quotes two miracles, in which the sacred Flesh and Blood were manifested in the Eucharist. Whatever discredit may be given to these events, it can scarcely be believed that they would be cited as a proof of the Real Presence by one who denied Transubstantiation.

"sacramentally" (1). Ælfric certainly denies the identity of the natural and the Eucharistic Body of Christ; so do some of the most orthodox of Catholic theologians. We cite the more familiar Lanfranc, the energetic adversary of the first Sacramentarian, Berengarius (2), and Bossuet (3). Ælfric styles the Eucharist a pledge and a figure; so does the Catholic Church (4). It has been asserted that the teaching of Ælfric represents the belief of the Anglo-Saxons. This is true, inasmuch as the whole nation believed that, in the Mass, the bread and wine were changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. But his peculiar opinion, as to the nature of the Eucharistic Body, orthodox though it was, was not held by any other Saxon writers, either of his time, or of preceding or posterior days. On the contrary, the doctrine of the identity of the natural and Eucharistic Body was frequently taught, and seems to have been the national belief. We have already quoted Bede as saying that the Body of the Lamb, which is offered on the altar, is the one by which we were redeemed; and in another place (5), he says "His Blood is not now shed by the hands of unbelievers, but received to their salvation in the mouths of the faithful." Alcuin tells us (6) that "the Mystery of the Body and Blood of the Lord is not to be called an image, but the truth; not a shadow, but the Body; not a figure of things to come, but that which was once prefigured by types; for He did not say 'this is the figure of my Body,' but 'this is my Body, which shall be given for ye.'" In a MS. once belonging to king Canute the Great (7) our Lord is said to have declared to His Apostles that "He gave them His Body to eat, and His Blood to drink, that Body which He should give up to be crucified, and that Blood which He should shed for them." In another MS. (8) of the same date, it

(1) Some modern theologians cling to "naturally" and "spiritually." See VERON; *Rule of Faith*, c. 11.

(2) In his treatise against Berengarius, c. 18, the Norman prelate says that, if we consider the mode of existence of the Eucharistic Body, we may truly say that it is not the same body which was born of Mary.

(3) Bossuet asserts that "in one sense, and regarding only the substance, it is the Body of Jesus Christ, born of Mary; but in another sense, and regarding only the manner, it is another, which is made by His words."

(4) Office and Mass of the Holy Sacrament; Anthem at *Magnificat*, and Postcommunion.

(5) *Homily for the Epiphany*.

(7) *Cott. MSS., Cal. a. 7.*

(6) *Caroline Books*, 4, c. 14.

(8) *Ibi*, *Tib.* c. 1.

is said that "The Lord did not say 'take this consecrated bread, and eat it in place of my Body,' or 'drink this consecrated wine in place of my Blood;' but, without any figure or circumlocution, He said 'this is my Body' and 'this is my Blood.' And, that He might prevent all wanderings of error, He said, 'which Body shall be given up for you,' and which Blood shall be shed for you.'"

With regard to the Sacrament of Penance, Henry contends that auricular confession was first inculcated to the Saxons by archbishop Theodore, in the seventh century, and that it was unknown to them before that time. We might dismiss this assertion with the remark that St. Augustine certainly converted the Saxons to the faith of Rome, which just as certainly commanded auricular confession. But Henry, following in the steps of Inett (1), says that private confession, according to the account given of it by Egbert, archbishop of York (8th century) was unknown to such of the Saxons as were converted by the Irish missionaries. Now, Egbert (2) says nothing about the introduction of confession, and nothing about the customs of the Saxons who were taught by the Irish; he does say, however, that, from the time of Theodore, the people had been accustomed to a twelve days' preparation, by fasting, confession, and alms, for the feast of Christmas. This by no means implies that confession was only then introduced among them. St. Cuthbert (d. 687) was a pupil of the Irish missionaries, and before Pope Vitalian commissioned Theodore to take charge of the see of Canterbury (668), had spent months receiving confessions in that diocese (3). That auricular confession was practised by the early Irish Christians, we have already seen when treating of the mission of St. Patrick. Since, however, Egbert of York is quoted as ignorant of this practice, we would draw attention to this passage from his *Penitential*: "The time of duty comes every twelve months, when every man shall speak to his confessor, and avow to God and his confessor all the sins he has committed." Whelock (4) asserts that the Saxon church advised, but did not prescribe, confes-

(1) *History of the English Church*, v. 1.

(2) *Institutions of the Church*.

(3) BEDE; *Life of Cuthbert*; c. 9. and 16.

(4) *History*, p. 215, index, art. *Confession*.

sion; and yet he furnishes us with two Homilies, from which we extract the following passages: "The holy Scriptures frequently teach us to flee to the medicine of true confession of our sins; because we cannot otherwise be healed, except we confess with sorrow what we have unrighteously done through negligence. All hope of forgiveness is in confession. Confession, with true repentance, is the angelic remedy of our sins. . . . Truly no man will obtain forgiveness of his sins from God, unless he confess to some one of God's ministers, and do penance according to his judgment."

It would be very interesting to notice the system of public penance of the Saxons, their consecration of virgins and monks to the service of God, the ceremonies with which they dedicated their temples, the coronation of their kings, the benediction of their knights, and many other features which denoted a truly Catholic people, but our limits compel us to confine ourselves to the elucidation of such points as will show that the modern Anglican or dissenter comes from a Catholic ancestor. English Protestantism has preserved some tattered remnants of nearly every Catholic garment with which Albion was once clothed, but of one vesture there is not a thread. We allude to the doctrine of purgatory, to the practice of praying for the dead. And yet the most rabid of our opponents admit that this custom was universal before the fourth century; some grant that it existed in the second. Mosheim ascribes its origin to Platonism, but Bingham (1) made the discovery that when our ancestors prayed for the dead, they believed them to be already in heaven. Whelock (2) asserts that the Saxons did not believe in purgatory, but he uses only the argument derived from the fact that some homilists say that, after the general judgment, the virtuous will be rewarded, and the wicked everlastingly punished; while all Catholics admit that then purgatory will be no more. Whelock must have missed the following passage, taken from a Saxon sermon on the dedication of a church, and published by himself: "There are also many places of punishment, in which souls

(1) *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, v. 1, p. 758, v. 2, p. 440.

(2) *Preface to the Archaionomia*.

suffer in proportion to their guilt, before the general judgment, and in which some are so far purified, as not to be hurt by the fire of the last day." Among the devotions for the departed, we find the "belt of Lord's prayers," a species of rosary; the anthem, "O Lord, according to Thy great mercy give rest to his soul, and in consideration of Thy infinite goodness, grant that he may enjoy eternal light in company with thy saints;" and finally, the chief devotion of all, the offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass for the departed soul. We are told that the object of all these devotions was simply a thanksgiving to God for the happiness already enjoyed by the dead. But not so thought the bishops of the Synod of Calcuith, when they ordered prayers for themselves, after their deaths, "that by means of a common intercession, they might merit a common eternal kingdom with all the saints" (1).

Immediately upon the death of St. Wilfrid, the abbot Tatbert, of the great monastery at Ripon, ordered a mass to be celebrated, and alms to be given to the poor, for the repose of his soul; on his anniversary, all the abbots, of the many monasteries he had founded, were summoned, and a night was spent in vigil and prayer, while the next morning, a Requiem mass was sung, and a tenth part of all the abbey's cattle was given to the poor (2). Lullus, the successor of St. Boniface in the see of Mentz, received from the king of Kent and the bishop of Rochester, a common letter, saying, "It is our earnest wish to recommend ourselves and our dearest relatives to your piety, that by your prayers we may be protected till we come to that life which knows no end. . . . Let us then agree, that when any one among us enters the path which leads to another life (may it be a life of happiness!), the survivors shall, by their alms and sacrifices, try to help him in his journey. We have sent you the names of our dead relatives, Irmige, Norththry, and Dulicha, virgins dedicated to God, and beg that you will remember them in your prayers and oblations" (3).

(1) WILKINS; *Council of Calcuith*.(2) EDDIUS; *Life of Wūfrid*.(3) *Epistles of St. Boniface*, No. 77.

Invocation of the saints was practiced by the Saxons, and a pre-eminence was given to the Blessed Virgin. Bede tells us a hymn was sung each evening in her honor, and in the old Saxon *Pontificals* we find many of the hymns which are now read in the *Breviary*. Among the many homilies which have come down to us, occur several for the feasts of the Nativity, Annunciation, Purification, and the Assumption of Mary. St. Peter seems to have occupied the next place in the devotion of the Saxons, and many of their first churches were dedicated to God in his honor. Pilgrimages were made to his tomb, and the Saxons were the originators of "Peter's Pence." Sts. Gregory and Augustine, to whom they principally owed their conversion, were venerated as patrons of England; St. Boniface, shortly after his death, was made a third patron (1). But we need not develop this point. Protestants admit the "excessive superstition" of the Saxons in this matter, and generally regard their saints as either fanatics, canonized by ignorance, or profligates, owing their honor to the gifts which they lavished upon the monasteries (2).

The sentiments of the Anglo-Saxon church with regard to the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff now claim our attention. St. Peter is styled by Bede "the prince of the Apostles, the shepherd of all believing nations" (3); Alcuin calls him "the head of the chosen flock" (4); St. Aldhelm attributes to him as a peculiar privilege, "the royal power of binding and loosing" (5). Nor did these Saxon fathers think that St. Peter's power died with him, for Bede declares that the Roman Pontiff "holds the chief Pontificate in the whole world" (6); and Alcuin calls him "the head of all Christian churches" (7). The veneration of the Saxons for the successor of St. Peter is shown by the numerous pilgrimages made to Rome, in spite of all the difficulties of

(1) *Epist. of St. Cuthbert to Lullus, in Epist. Bonif., No. 70.*

(2) Thus Sturges and Rapin. See Lingard's *Antiquities*, c. 9.

(3) *B. 2, c. 4. Homily on Vig. of St. Andrew.*

(4) *Epistle to Abp. Eanbald.*

(5) *Epist. to king Gerontius, in Epist. of Boniface, No. 44.*

(6) *B. 2, c. 1. Homily for Feast of St. Benedict.*

(7) *Epistles to Popes Adrian and Leo.*

travel at that day ; besides crowds of nobles and prelates, the kings Caedwalla, Ina, Offa, Kenred, Siric, Ethelwulph, and Canute, went to Rome to implore the Papal benediction. The Pope's charter was considered of greater importance than that of the king, for the perpetuity of an institution ; hence the numerous Bulls creating or endorsing religious establishments, and threatening their violators with the punishments of Dathan, Abiron, and Judas. Certain modern writers have asserted that the Anglo-Saxon kings exercised a spiritual jurisdiction (1), but the records of the time furnish no proof of such exercise, or even of any claim to it. Wintred, king of Kent (692), says "it is the right of the king to appoint earls, ealdormen, shire-reeves, and doomsmen ; but it is the right of the archbishop to rule and provide for the church of God" (2). Sometimes, indeed, the king is called the Vicar of Christ, but the *Saxon Laws* explain the sense in which the term is applied. "The king ought to be a father to his people, and in watchfulness and care, the vicar of Christ, as he is called." The Anglo-Saxon monarchs claimed no right to establish, extend, or restrict, episcopal jurisdiction ; such pertained to the Papal prerogative. The first ecclesiastical partition of England was made by Pope Gregory the Great, and not by the kings of the Heptarchy, or by the missionaries. When events prevented the execution of the original plan, Pope Vitalian placed all the Saxon bishops under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Canterbury ; sixty years afterwards, Gregory III. restored the primacy to York, and very soon, Adrian I. gave the metropolitan jurisdiction to Lichfield, which, though displeasing to the other prelates, was respected until withdrawn by Leo III. The Synod of Cloveshoe (803) says of this contest for precedence, "When the Apostolic Pope understood the injustice which had been done, he at once interposed his authority, and sent orders into England that the honor of the see of St. Augustine should be fully restored." But not only were the powers of the Saxon metropolitans circumscribed by Rome ; their

(1) COKE : *Reports*, p. 5.(2) WILKINS : *Councils*.

election had to be confirmed by the Pontiff. The archbishops did not receive the pallium (1), as a rule, until they had presented themselves at Rome, and undergone an examination as to faith, fitness, &c. ; but St. Gregory had dispensed the Saxon primates from the laborious journey, and his immediate successors had continued the exemption. Abuses having crept into the Saxon church, and birth and wealth having sometimes influenced the choice of bishops, the Holy See, in the interests of religion, resolved to enforce the ancient discipline. The Saxon prelates murmured and demurred, but yet they submitted (2). The supremacy of the Roman See over the Saxon church, is also evident from the supervision constantly exercised by the Pontiffs over religious matters in the island. In 680, Pope Agatho summoned Theodore of Canterbury and his suffragans to attend a Roman Synod, called to check Monothelitism, but the British prelates begged to be excused on account of the necessities of their infant churches. The Pontiff granted the request, but demanded a Profession of their faith, appointing as Papal legate to receive it, John, abbot of St. Martin's. The bishops met the legate at Hethfield, and declared their acceptance of the œcumenical Councils, and of the condemnation of Monethelitism by Pope Martin I.; the legate then sent a copy of the Synodical acts to Rome (3). Some of the Canterbury prelates were wanting in activity, if not in piety, and reports reached Pope Zachary of Saxon immorality ; archbishop Cuthbert and his suffragans were therefore threatened with excommunication, if they did not enforce the canons. The Synod of Cloveshoe was convoked, and thirty reformatory canons were issued, affecting the morals of bishops, priests, monks, and laity. The *Acts* of this Synod describe the admonitory epistle of Pope Zachary in language which plainly denotes willing acquiescence in Papal supremacy. "Two letters of the Apostolic

(1) The pallium is a vestment sent by the Pope to archbishops, and until its reception, certain important functions cannot be performed by the said prelates. When the archbishop of Canterbury had received the pallium, he was called a legate of the Holy See. Thus Brithwald, although a Saxon, and elected by the clergy of Canterbury, is styled by his own messengers, "archbishop of the church of Canterbury and of all Britain, sent from this Apostolic see." EDDIUS, *Life of Wilfrid*, c. 51.

(2) WILKINS, *Councils*, year 1031.

(3) BEDE ; *B. 4*, c. 18.

lord, Pope Zachary, were brought forward, and what he commanded, in his Apostolic authority, was plainly and with great diligence made known, and more clearly interpreted in our own language. For in these writings he familiarly admonished the inhabitants of our race in this island of Britain, and truly accused them, and finally, lovingly exhorted them; those, however, who would condemn all this, and would persist pertinaciously in their malice, he threatened with the certain sentence of anathema" (1). The 25th canon of this Synod is alleged by Henry to have been framed "to guard against the encroachments of the Popes." It reads, "If a bishop is unable to correct and amend anything in his diocese, let him bring it before the archbishop in Synod, to be openly corrected by all." Henry urges that this canon militates against appeals to Rome, but St. Boniface, who originally composed it, adds immediately after it, "for thus, unless I err, all bishops should make known to the metropolitan, *and he to the Roman Pontiff*, if they cannot correct their flocks, and thus they will be foreign to the loss of their souls" (2). In the reign of Pope Adrian I., the bishops of Ostia and Tudertum were sent as legates (3) to the Saxon church, with a code of laws for its use. They held a Synod in Mercia, and one in Northumbria; they published twenty canons, and exacted from each bishop a solemn promise to enforce them. Carte contends that this legation was merely a renewal of correspondence between the

(1) Henry discovers in the 2nd canon of Cloveshoe "a sufficient proof that the clergy of England were not yet disposed to bend their necks to the intolerable and ignominious yoke of Rome." *Vol. III., p. 325.* Premising that "probably" the synod was held at the suggestion of St. Boniface, and that its canons were chiefly taken from the synod of Mentz, he says that the Saxon prelates altered the canon on "the unity of the Church"; that while St. Boniface had professed obedience to the Pontiff, the Saxons make no mention of Rome. But the bishops of Cloveshoe expressly state that they assembled because of the command of Pope Zachary; and so far are the thirty canons from being derived from the nine of Mentz, there is scarcely a passage in which they bear resemblance. Finally, there is no canon, either of Mentz or of Cloveshoe, on the "unity of the Church"; there is one, however, on the "unity of peace," applying only to the subscribers, but which Henry has impudently falsified, firstly, by omitting the agreement to live in peace, which restricts the meaning of the canon to the signers, and secondly, by translating *eos* (themselves) "all the clergy in the world." The *Acts* tell us that "The prelates turned to each other with words of mutual exhortation. . . . and they entered into an engagement, that intimate peace and sincere charity should forever dwell among themselves, and that there should be a concord of all in all ecclesiastical rights, in speech, in word, and in judgment, without flattery of any person." There was no reason why the prelates of Cloveshoe should speak of their submission to Rome, but there was every reason for Boniface so doing, as he had been sent among the pagan Germans by the Pontiff.

(2) *Epistle to Cuthbert*, in Wilkins, p. 91.

(3) Hume misses this legation, as well as that of the abbot John, under Pope Agatho, when he says that Ermanfroi of Sion, three centuries afterwards, was the first Papal legate to Britain. *History, c. 4.*

churches of Rome and England, but the letter of the legates to the Pontiff shows that they were invested with authority. "We wrote Capitulars on each matter, and having arranged all things in order, brought them to their notice. With all due humility they received both your admonition and our littleness, and promised to obey in all things" (1).

The history of St. Wilfrid, bishop of York, furnishes an excellent proof of the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff over the early Saxon church, although Carte, and, imitating him, many other Protestant writers, try to evince the contrary. This prelate, owing to the impatient zeal of Theodore of Canterbury, on the one hand, and the wicked enmity of Egfrid and Ermenburga, king and queen of Northumbria, on the other, suddenly found his extensive diocese divided into three, and himself left without subjects (2). His remonstrances being treated with contempt, he took the advice of some of his episcopal friends, and appealed to Rome (3). Had Theodore held the views which some Protestants ascribe to the Saxon church, he would have ridiculed this appeal. But, on the contrary, he endeavored to first get the ear of the Pontiff, and when Wilfrid arrived in Rome (678), he found that Cœnwald, an envoy of Theodore, had already presented his side of the case. Nevertheless, Pope Agatho convened a Synod, composed of the suburban bishops and fifty of the Roman clergy, and listened to the plea of Wilfrid. The result was that Wilfrid was restored to his diocese of York, but he was ordered to choose from among his clergy a certain number of bishops to help him in its government; this decision was coupled with a decree of suspension against any cleric, and of excommunication against any layman, who would presume to oppose it. Wilfrid now returned to England, but Egfrid threw him into prison. It is to be noted that the enemies of the holy bishop did not deny the Papal right to interfere in this case. During the nine months of his confinement, they endeavored, by promises and threats, to make him avow that the presumed decision was a forgery, or at least procured by bribery. For several years Wilfrid was exiled from his diocese,

(1) WILKINS; *Councils*, p. 146.

(2) For details, see Lingard's *Antiquities*, c. 5.

(3) EDDIUS; *Life of Wilfrid*, c. 24.

but finally the primate Theodore repented of his conduct, and wrote intercessory letters for him to the kings of Mercia and Northumbria. Aldfrid, the new ruler of Northumbria, restored him to York, and for five years he administered its ecclesiastical affairs. But new persecutions arrived, and Wilfrid fled into Mercia (1). To settle matters, Brithwald, the successor of Theodore, called a Synod in Northumbria, to which Wilfrid was invited. When asked to abide by the decision of his metropolitan, Wilfrid replied that he would do so, "if that decision be not contrary to the canons, and to the declarations of the Apostolic See." Another appeal to Rome now ensued. Wilfrid conducted his own case before Pope John V., while his opponents were represented by a deputation of monks. Seventy times was the question debated, and after four months' discussion, the Pontiff decided in accordance with a compromise proposed by Wilfrid himself (2). This history of Wilfrid speaks so plainly in favor of the Papal supremacy over the Saxon church, that Carte uses every exertion to misrepresent it. Thus, speaking of the saint's first appeal to Rome, he refers to Eddius, c. 24, as proof that "Wilfrid's appeal appeared so new and singular, that it occasioned general laughter, as a thing quite ridiculous." But the fact is that Eddius, c. 24, says no such thing; he tells us that "the flatterers of the king expressed their joy in laughter," and adds the reason in the words of Wilfrid, "who laugh because of my condemnation." Carte also asserts that the king would not restore Wilfrid, because he deemed the Pontiff's course derogatory to the rights of the crown. But Eddius, c. 33, assigns as the royal pretext, the accusation that the saint had procured the Pope's decision by bribery. Carte quotes Eddius, c. 25, as authority for the assertion that the king offered Wilfrid a part of his old diocese, if he would deny the authority of the Pontifical mandate; but Eddius, c. 25, says this offer was made on condition that Wilfrid would deny the authenticity of the

(1) Wilfrid had been ordered by the king to surrender the monastery of Ripon, to which he was greatly attached, that it might be made a bishopric for another prelate. His enemies thought that he would refuse to obey, and would hence be ruined. Ripon had been greatly improved by Wilfrid, and its monks, the first Benedictines of the north of England, revered him as a father.

(2) Wilfrid resigned the greater part of his diocese, and secured the possession of his two favorite monasteries of Ripon and Hexham.

mandate. Carte contends, on the authority of Theodore's letter to king Ethelred, that the prelate of Canterbury was reconciled finally with Wilfrid, not because of his respect for the Pope's decision, but on account of his personal veneration for Wilfrid. But in this very letter to Ethelred, Theodore alleges the Papal mandate as the cause of his reconciliation. "Therefore I, the humble bishop Theodore, decrepit with age, suggest this to your Blessedness, because, as you know, Apostolic authority commands it" (1). In dismissing this episode of St. Wilfrid, we would remark that, about the same time, occurred the appeal of Egwin of Worcester to Rome, and with equal success. In fine, the use of appeals to the Holy See was, from this period, established among the Anglo-Saxons, and among the laws collected by archbishop Egbert for the clergy of York, there is a canon which formally declares their legality.

We shall now briefly touch upon a point, which, though merely of discipline, and therefore, if the Church were to so will, subject to change, is seized by many Protestant writers (2), as showing a great difference between the early Saxon church and that of Rome. It is asserted that the Roman Pontiffs enjoined celibacy upon the clergy only in the tenth century; that hence, for nearly five hundred years after their conversion, the Saxon clergy were allowed to marry. We shall treat of the origin of clerical celibacy in a special chapter, but as concerns the Saxon church, we would ask our opponents for some positive proof, however slight, that marriage was ever permitted to the Saxon clergymen. Inett, says Lingard, is the only author who has ventured to corroborate such an assertion by an appeal to contemporary authority, and he refers to the *Penitentiary* of Theodore, "which was published by Petit with so many interpolations that it is impossible to distinguish the original from the spurious matter." In this *Penitentiary*, we read that "it is not permitted to men to have females as nuns, nor to females (to have) men (as monks); nevertheless, let us not destroy

(1) WILKINS; *Ep. Theod.* EDDIUS: c. 42.

(2) Matthew Tindall's translation of Rapin's *History of England*. HUME; *Hist.*, c. 2. BURTON; *Monast. of York*.

the custom of the country (1)." How this passage can be construed as referring to marriage, we do not perceive; but, if we suppose that allusion is made to the double monasteries, those where both sexes were admitted, though with a separation, then the canon has a meaning, viz., the condemnation of such establishments. But the discipline founded by St. Augustine in England, is proved to have been celibitic, by the epistle of Pope St. Gregory the Great to the holy missionary, sent in reply to one asking for advice on many disciplinary points (2). The Pontiff says that "clerics, *who are not in sacred orders*, if they cannot contain themselves, ought to take wives." And the same is forcibly expressed by Ceolfrid, abbot of Weremouth (3), saying that clerics ought to crucify their flesh with its vices and concupiscences . . . . . they should bind themselves, for the Lord, with tighter chains of chastity." Bede (4) tells us that "without that chastity which restrains one from the appetite for carnal union, no one should enter the priesthood, or be consecrated to the ministry of the altar; that is, unless he is either a virgin, or has dissolved the marital connection." Archbishop Egbert (5) says that "neither priests nor deacons can take wives." In his *Penitentiary*, he declares that "God's priests and deacons, and God's other servants, who should serve in God's temple, and touch the Sacrament and the holy books, should always observe their chastity." In the same work, although as yet Holy Orders had not been made a "diriment" impediment to Matrimony, degradation is pronounced against the priest or deacon who married. And it is also decreed that "if any man in orders, bishop, priest, monk, deacon, had his wife, ere he was ordained, and forsook her for God's sake, and received ordination, and they afterwards return together again through lust, let each fast, according to his order, as is written above with respect to murder" (6). Such was the discipline of the ancient Saxon church, and if, when the invasions of the Danes had nearly destroyed ecclesiastical as well as civil order, many of the clergy were guilty of its violation, the

(1) The parentheses are inserted by us, as necessary to the sense. (4) *Taber.*, b. 3, c. 9.

(2) *Works*, b. 12, *epist.* 31. BEDE: b. 1, c. 27.

(5) *Extracts*, can. 160.

(3) *Epistle to King Naiton*, in *Bede*, b. 5, b. 21.

(6) That is, for ten or seven years.

Church never approved of their conduct, but, whenever the nature of the times permitted her to attempt the restoration of order, she enforced the celibacy of her servants.

We have as yet only alluded to the British church, which, at the time of St. Augustine's arrival among the Anglo-Saxons of the heptarchy (1), was leading a precarious life in the mountains of Wales. If we may credit the assertions of Gildas, their countryman and contemporary, the British clergy of the sixth century had fearfully fallen from the sanctity of their profession. The dignities of the Church were bought with presents, or seized by force, "and the fortunate candidate was more frequently indebted for his success to the arms of his kindred, than to the justice of his pretensions. Indolence had induced a passion for ebriety and excess; the patrimony of the poor was sacrificed to the acquisition of sensual gratifications; the most solemn oaths were sworn and violated with equal facility; and the son, from the example of his father, readily imbibed a contempt for clerical chastity" (2). This state of affairs was undoubtedly due to the relaxation of discipline, consequent upon the long and fearful wars with the Saxons. To remedy these evils, Pope St. Gregory invested St. Augustine with jurisdiction over the British hierarchy, but it was not easy to enforce a recognition of that jurisdiction. Augustine was a foreigner, and was connected with the hated Saxon; to bend to his authority seemed tantamount to subjecting themselves again to the barbarian. Again, the Roman missionary was of stern and uncompromising morality—no pleasing omen for their soft and enticing sins. However, St. Augustine directed himself to the task. Helped by Ethelbert, king of Kent, recently converted to the faith, he arranged a meeting with the British bishops at the frontier. For an entire day he exhorted, instructed, and threatened, and although a miracle is said to have somewhat touched their obstinacy,

(1) We use the word "heptarchy" in deference to custom, although England was, at that time, an "octarchy." Bernicia and Deira had not yet coalesced in the kingdom of Northumbria.

(2) LINGARD: *Antiquities*, c. 2. The pious indignation of Gildas may have caused him to color his picture very highly, but that it was substantially correct, one is led to believe by the treatment accorded by the Britons to Augustine. Their obstinacy can be accounted for, only in the supposition of their corruption.

Augustine prevailed no further than receiving a promise for another conference. Before the British prelates came to the second meeting, they consulted a certain holy hermit. This individual told them that if, at the interview, Augustine arose and advanced towards them, they might regard him as worthy of attention; but that they should contemn him, if he kept his seat (1). It happened that Augustine did not arise to meet the British bishops, and accordingly, they rejected his demands. These were: that they should conform to the general usage in computing the Paschal time; that they should use the Roman rite in Baptism; and that they should help to convert the Saxons. In his disappointment, Augustine exclaimed, "Know then, that if you will not assist me in pointing out to the Saxons the way of life, they, by the just judgment of God, will prove to you the ministers of death." The prophecy was fulfilled eight years after the death of the saint, when, in 613, the Pagan Edelfrid, king of Northumbria, attacked the British near the city of Chester. Before the onslaught of the Saxons, more than twelve hundred monks from the establishment at Bangor proceeded to the top of a neighboring hill, that they might, Moses-like, pray for God's blessing on the arms of their countrymen. Observing this movement, and divining its object, Edelfrid cried to his followers to attack the unfortunate brethren, "for," said he, "those who pray against us, fight against us." A British detachment under Brocmail, which had been ordered to defend the hill, disgracefully fled, leaving the monks to their fate. Only fifty re-entered their monastery. This melancholy event has been a rich morsel to certain moderns of the reformed persuasion, who, greedily swallowing the assertions of the fabulist Geoffrey of Monmouth (2), ascribe the massacre of the monks of Bangor to the revengeful intrigues of the Roman missionary (3). But Bede expressly declares that the battle of Chester took place, "Augustine having been, a long time before, trans-

(1) BEDE; *b.* 2, *c.* 2..

(2) Geoffrey of Monmouth (1100-1154), bishop of St. Asaph, was author of a *Chronicle of the Britons*, professedly a translation of an older Welsh work, but so filled with legend as to possess little historical value. Geoffrey's prime object was the exaltation of his British ancestors at the expense of their conquerors' reputation; hence the above assertion.

(3) BALE; *Cent.* 13, *c.* 1. PARKER; *p.* 48. GODWIN, *p.* 33.

ferred to the heavenly kingdom ;" and he assigns as a reason of the massacre, the appearance of the monks on the battlefield. Godwin tries to evade this testimony of Bede, by asserting that the passage must be an interpolation, since it is not found in king Alfred's Saxon version of the historian. But it is found in all the Latin MSS., even in that of More(1), written within two years from the death of Bede. Again, Godwin forgets that the version of Alfred is more of a synopsis than a translation, for the royal scholar often omits entire passages, and nearly always abridges the text. In the very place in discussion, he omits the flight of Brocmail, and the date of ordination of Justus and Mellitus.

It has been asserted that the ancient British church had never recognized the supremacy of Rome, and that it refused to receive from St. Augustine the "new dogmas" of saint-worship, purgatory, confession, &c. As for Roman supremacy, Bede, Gildas, and other authors, furnish many proofs of its having been acknowledged by the Britons. It was to Pope Eleutherius that king Lucius (y. 182) applied for the means of instruction for his people. In the year 429, when St. Germain of Auxerre and St. Lupus of Troyes passed into Britain to combat Pelagianism, the former was legate of Pope Cœlestine. According to Gildas, the communion of the Britons with the Roman See had never been broken, which certainly shows that the head of that See was obeyed as the chief pastor of the Church. As for the "new dogmas," Bede informs us that the Britons admitted the orthodoxy of St. Augustine's doctrines, and both he and Gildas declare that, from the time of their conversion to the days of the Roman missionary, their faith had never been corrupted, unless, temporarily, by Arianism and Pelagianism.

(1) LINGARD ; *Antiquities*, c. 2.

## CHAPTER XXXIV.

### THE MONOTHELITIC HERESY, AND THE SIXTH GENERAL COUNCIL.

The events of which we are now about to treat are of the utmost interest to the student, for they gave rise to a most important controversy, viz., that regarding the alleged heresy of Pope Honorius. We shall consider this question in a special chapter, but before entering upon it, it is necessary to sketch the nature of the heresy which was its occasion, and to speak of the Council which condemned that heresy. The prime error of the Monothelites was the assertion that in Christ there is but one operation, and one will. They held that human nature was so united to the Word, that, although it was endowed with a mind and the faculties belonging to itself, yet it did not exercise its own action; action in Christ was one, proceeding from the Word as from a principal cause, and from the humanity as from an instrumental cause. This heresy, as Petau remarks (1), was a progeny of Eutychianism, that is, of the defenders of one Nature in Christ. Cyrus, bishop of Alexandria, one of the leaders of the Monothelites, says that Christ "operates with one *theandric* operation those things which belong to God, and those which are human." Macarius, bishop of Antioch, another leader, in a long Profession of Faith read in the Sixth Council, says, "Christ did not perform divine things as God, nor human things as man, but God being made man, showed a certain new *theandric* operation," and he asserted the same of Christ's will. Contrary to this, the Church taught that in Christ there are two natural wills, and two natural operations, undivided, inconvertible, inseparable, and unconfused.

As Alexandre justly observes, the emperor Heraclius (d. 641) acted as accoucheur at the birth of the Monothelitic heresy, first, by his decrees against the Severian heretic,

(1) *Dogmas*, b. 1, c. 20.

Paul of Armenia, to whom Sergius alludes in his epistle to Honorius, read in the 16th *Action* of the Sixth Council; again, when he was deceived by the Jacobite patriarch, Athanasius, into sympathy for the new doctrine. The real parent of the heresy was Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople. Politics too had their share in its propagation, for Heraclius was greatly influenced in its favor by his hatred of Chosroes, the Persian king, who patronized the Nestorians; hence it was that the emperor leaned towards the Eutychians, natural foes of Nestorianism, not that he believed in the doctrine of one Nature, which had been condemned at Chalcedon, but because he did not perceive the equal danger of asserting one operation and will, and he thought that he might thus bring the Monophysites back to the fold. The first sign of the coming heresy was observed when, having talked with the Severian Paul, Heraclius issued an order, styled *Jussio*, against him, prohibiting the assertion of a double operation in Christ. In the year 633, Cyrus of Alexandria held a Synod, ostensibly for the conversion of the Eutychians, and he there issued nine chapters, the seventh of which asserted that, according to St. Dionysius, Christ operated both divine and human things, by *one* theandric operation. He had corrupted the text of his holy predecessor, inserting *one* where Dionysius had said *a new* theandric operation. These chapters Cyrus sent to Sergius, who congratulated him upon them, and asserted the same doctrine, "because every divine and human operation proceeded from one and the same God, the Incarnate Word." At this time, there lived at Alexandria a holy and learned monk named Sophronius, who in vain endeavored to influence Cyrus to abrogate his chapters, but when he had become bishop of Jerusalem, Sophronius held a Synod of the bishops of Palestine, and sent out a Synodical letter in which he plainly asserted the doctrine of two operations. When Sergius received this letter of Sophronius, he devised a means for preserving, yet so as to hide, his error. He sent to Pope Honorius the letter which was afterwards read in the twelfth *Action* of the Sixth Council, and in which he suggested that neither of the words "one" or "two"

should be used in regard to Christ's operations, as they gave so much scandal to the simple. but that it should be said that the one only Son of God operated both divine and human things. Honorius answered Sergius, praising him for trying to avoid the scandal of simple souls, and concluding in these words: "Let your Fraternity teach with us these things, as we with one mind teach with you, exhorting you, that abandoning the new words "one" or "two operations," you teach with orthodox faith and Catholic unity that the one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the Living God, True God in two Natures, operated both divinely and humanly." In another epistle to Sergius, Honorius decreed that, "the lately introduced use of the words 'one or two operations' should be left out in teaching, because it is unsuitable to think or to explain whether the Mediator between God and men, the Lord Jesus Christ, is or was of one or two operations." This letter has caused some to hold that Pope Honorius erred in faith; others have condemned him for allowing silence where silence was culpable. We shall treat the question in the next chapter. Pope Honorius died in October, 638; his successor was Severinus. About the end of the year 638, Sergius composed a decree for Heraclius, called an *Ecthesis* or "Exposition," which was issued in the name of the emperor. In this document the ostensible object is to command all to refrain from using the words "one" or "two operations," but, in parenthesis, as it were, the one will and one operation in Christ are asserted. When the new Pontiff sent, according to custom, his legates to Constantinople, to acquaint the emperor of his election, the Monothelites endeavored to impede his recognition by Heraclius, until he would promise to approve of the Sergico-imperial Exposition. The document was accordingly sent to the Exarch of Ravenna, with orders to obtain the Pontifical assent. That Severinus refused, we learn from Pope Martin I., in the Lateran Synod of 649. We gather the same from the *Diurnal of the Roman Pontiffs*, which contains the Profession of Faith which, before the Sixth Council, a new Pope was obliged to make: "We promise also to observe all the decrees of the Pontiffs of the Apostolic

See, that is, of *Severinus*, of John, of Theodore, and of Martin, against the new questions arisen in the imperial city, professing, according to the movement of the two Natures, so there are two natural operations; and whatever they have condemned, we condemn under anathema" (1). In the year 639, Sergius died, and was succeeded by Pyrrhus, a monk and a steady Monothelite, who immediately approved of the Exposition. At the same time the Holy See received a new Pontiff in the person of John IV. One of his first acts was the condemnation of Monothelitism and of the Exposition, but without mentioning any persons. When Heraclius heard of this condemnation, he wrote to the Pope, protesting that the Exposition was a production of the late Sergius, and that he now renounced all connection with it. In the meantime, Pyrrhus had fled for his life from Constantinople, having been attacked by the enraged populace on account of being suspected of having conspired with the empress Martina against the life of Heraclius and his eldest son Constantine. The new emperor, Constans, put into his place another Monothelite named Paul, who immediately wrote such a specious letter to Pope Theodore, successor to John IV., that the Pontiff congratulated him on his orthodoxy. However, some time afterwards, being hard pressed by the Pope's legate to send an explicit Profession of Faith to Rome, he wrote in such terms as to leave no doubt of his heterodoxy. The fugitive Pyrrhus had spent his exile in Africa, and occupied his time in sowing the seed of Monothelitism; but being defeated in dispute by the Abbot Maximus in full Synod, he acknowledged his error, ascribed it to ignorance, and set out for Rome with the victor. Here he abjured his heresy at the feet of Pope Theodore, as we learn from Theophanes and Anastasius. But he soon relapsed, and showed that he had played the hypocrite to secure the Papal influence in regaining his see. In the meantime, the intruding patriarch Paul, being threatened with excommunication, tried to save his position by suggesting to the emperor Constans an edict, in which silence

(1) From this document, Pagi concludes, and with some reason, that Severinus condemned the Monothelites in a Synod. At that time, the Pontiffs were accustomed to issue their decrees synodically.

was enjoined as to the number of operations and wills in Christ, but in which, to blind the Catholics, certain Monothelitic placards, affixed to the doors of the cathedral, were ordered to be torn down. Silence, he thought, as to the number of operations, would ensure a victory to his heresy. This instrument, which was called a "*Type*," was promulgated in 648, and had the fate of Zeno's *Henoticon*, and almost all imperial theological essays. It pleased neither Catholics nor heretics, and, if it was not condemned by Pope Theodore at the same time that he condemned Pyrrhus, it was certainly branded by Martin I. in 649. That we may at once be disburdened of the two worthies, Pyrrhus and Paul, we will state that both were excommunicated by Pope Theodore; that on the death of Paul<sup>(1)</sup>, Pyrrhus regained the patriarchate of Constantinople by the favor of Constans, and died a Monothelite. Pope Martin I. commenced his reign in 649, and was immediately confronted by Constans with a demand for the approbation of the *Type*. The Pontiff's answer was the call of a Synod of 105 bishops, and the condemnation of Monothelitism and its professors, and that of the Exposition of Heraclius, and the *Type* of Constans himself. The reward of the Pontiff's firmness was the crown of martyrdom. Taken prisoner in Rome, he was first exiled to Naxos, then thrown into a dungeon at Constantinople, and finally transported to the Chersonese, where he succumbed to torture and disease in the year 655.

During the remainder of the reign of Constans, things prospered with the Monothelites, but with the advent of Constantine Pogonatus, came a change. Having beaten back the Saracens, made peace with the Bulgarians, and otherwise ameliorated the temporal condition of the empire, this sovereign, like a true Byzantine monarch, turned his attention to the arrangement of ecclesiastical affairs. But fortunately he was sincerely desirous of unity, and, for once, such meddling was productive of unmitigated good. Inquiring of Theodore of Constantinople and of Macarius of Antioch

(1) While Paul was dying, Pope Martin was being dragged in chains through the street by the public executioner, and was expecting sentence of death. Constans visited Paul, and told him the state of "his enemy." Stricken with remorse, the heresiarch besought the emperor to spare the life "of so good a Pontiff. This fills up the measure of my iniquities." *Epist. of Anastasius to the Westerns.*

what was the real cause of dissension, he was told that certain new words had been introduced, either ignorantly or rashly, into theological terminology, and that the innovation had produced a dangerous schism. Constantine then sent his secretary to Rome, asking Pope Donus to send his legates to Constantinople, and also to forward all books and documents which would be useful in settling the dispute. In the meantime, he called a General Council. The letters of Constantine were received by Pope Agatho, who had succeeded Donus in the Holy See. This Pontiff, in the year 680, sent as legates to the Council the priests Theodore and George, and the deacon John. In the previous year he had caused various Synods to be celebrated in the principal churches of the West, as preparatory to the great Council. The most important of these were held at Rome, at Milan, at Arles, and in England; and in all, Monothelitism was condemned. The Sixth General Council, called Third of Constantinople, was opened on Nov. 7. The number of bishops is not certain, for while Theophanes and Cedrenus make it 289, the last *Action* was subscribed by only 166. During the first eleven *Actions*, and the last, the emperor was present, but only as the Defender of the Faith and a preserver of order (1). That Pogonatus attempted nothing unbecoming a layman, is evident from his own words, thus recorded by Pope Gregory II. (2): "Nor shall I sit with them as an emperor (literally, "as a commander"), nor shall I speak imperiously; but, like one of themselves, I shall execute what the bishops order. Those who speak properly, we shall admit; those who talk badly, we shall expel, and send into exile. If my father should in any way pervert the pure and inviolable faith, I would be the first to anathematize him." His signature to the proceedings of the Council comes after those of the bishops, and whereas each bishop signs: "I, bishop of . . . defining, have subscribed," Pogonatus uses the phrase: "We, Constantine, in Christ God, King and Emperor of the Romans, have read and consented." Because

(1) With regard to the convocation and presidency of the Sixth Council, the reader may apply, *mutatis mutandis*, what we have said, regarding such matters, when treating of previous Councils. See Alexander's *Diss. I., in 7th Cent.*, with Roncaglia's comments.

(2) *Epist. to Leo the Isaurian.*

we sometimes read that the emperors "presided" at Councils, we must not understand that they occupied any other than an honorary position. In the *Actions* of the Seventh Council, we read that the empress Irene "presided."

The following is a summary of the *Actions* of the Sixth Council: In the 1st *Action*, the Papal legates announced the object of the Council to be the refutation of the heresies introduced into the Church by the later patriarchs of Constantinople. Macarius of Antioch replied that the doctrines enumerated were not new, but taken from the fathers and from definitions of the Councils. Codices of the Five General Councils were then introduced and consulted. The first *Action* of Ephesus was read, because Macarius asserted that in it was taught the doctrine of one will in Christ; he was found in error. In the 2nd *Action*, the *Acts* of Chalcedon were read, and Macarius was refuted by Pope St. Leo's *Dogmatic Epistle*. In the 3rd *Action*, when the *Acts* of the Fifth Council were read, a dispute arose as to an epistle of Mennas of Constantinople to Pope Vigilius, in which one will was asserted. The Papal legates declared the letter not authentic, and when a comparison of codices was made, and the different ones found to vary, the document was excluded. Then were read some letters of Vigilius to Justinian and the empress Theodora, and the legates cried out, "God forbid!" "Vigilius never asserted one operation," "This book has been falsified." The fathers then ordered the corrupted passages to be suppressed, although they anathematized the book as presented (1). In the 4th *Action*, was read the *Dogmatic Epistle* of Pope Agatho to the Council, in which the Pontiff declares that "The Apostolic Roman Church has never turned from the way of truth into any path of error whatever," and asserts the Catholic dogma as to the two wills and operations in Christ. In the 5th and 6th *Actions*, the emperor urged Macarius to put forth such testimonies of the

(1) Judging from the controversy agitated in 677, between Theodore of Constantinople and Macarius, and from the Greek codex, it would seem that the legates used an imperfect copy. However, the legates were forced to interfere, because, says Baronio, when the reader came to the anathema against Theodore of Mopsueste, launched because he did not avow one Person in Christ, it was found that a falsifier's hand had added, "and one operation." As for the anathematization of Vigilius' book, see the 14th *Action*.

fathers as he believed to warrant the assertion of only one will in Christ. He did so, but the legates insisted that the quoted passages applied only to the divine will. The 7th *Action* was taken up by the recitation of testimonies of the fathers proving that there were two wills and operations in Christ. The emperor then demanded of the Constantinopolitan and Antiochian patriarchs whether they consented to the definition of Pope Agatho; they requested a copy of the definition, and time for consideration. In the 8th *Action*, arrived the crucial moment for the Monothelites. When George of Constantinople was asked for his final decision, he declared that he accepted the definition of Pope Agatho, and all of his suffragans made the same submission. Then from the episcopal benches arose the acclamation, 'Many years to George, the orthodox patriarch!' The fathers then proceeded to the examination of Macarius of Antioch. After some tergiversation on his part, he was ordered to categorically answer whether he admitted two natural wills and two natural operations in Christ, and he answered that he would not admit them, "even if he were cut limb from limb, and thrown into the sea." Strange to say, he coupled his firmness with an admission that he had corrupted and twisted the sayings of the fathers of the Church, in order to prop up his tottering heresy. When the bishops heard this shameless avowal, they exclaimed, "It does not become the orthodox to mutilate the sayings of the fathers; that is fit for heretics." Finally, from all sides burst forth the cries of "He has shown himself a heretic. Anathema to the new Dioscorus. Evil years to the new Apollinarius. Let him be stripped of the Pallium!" In the 9th *Action*, Macarius was deposed from his patriarchate; the bishops and priests who abjured Monothelitism were forgiven, on condition that they submitted to the Council a sworn Profession of Faith. Most of the following *Actions* are of minor importance, with the exception of those in which occur the anathemas to Pope Honorius, and they will be quoted when we examine the alleged heresy of that Pontiff. The 14th *Action*, however, is worthy of mention. In it were read the books of Mennas to Vigilius, and of Vigilius to Justinian and

Theodora. All the bishops pronounced them suppositions, or corrupted by the Monothelites. Hence they exclaimed, "Anathema to the books which are said to have been sent by Vigilius to Justinian and Theodora, and which have been proven false." In the 17th and 18th *Actions*, was promulgated the Definition of Faith, and anathema pronounced on all who taught one will and one operation in our Lord Jesus Christ.

The assembled prelates sent a Synodical Letter to Pope Agatho, requesting his confirmation of their decrees. "We have manifested with you," they say, "the resplendent light of the orthodox faith; wherefore we pray your paternal Holiness to confirm our action by your honorable rescripts." But news of the death of Pope Agatho and of the election of Leo II. having come to Constantinople, the emperor gave the returning legates letters to the new Pontiff, also asking for the confirmation of the Council. Pope Leo conceded the confirmation, in a letter to Pogonatus, saying: "And because the Holy Synod issued a Definition of the true faith, the same as that reverently held by the Apostolic See of Blessed Peter the Apostle, whose office, although unworthy, we fill; therefore, we, and through us, this venerable Apostolic See, concordantly and unanimously consent to and confirm it, by the authority of Blessed Peter, that its teaching may acquire firmness from the Lord Himself upon the solid Rock, which is Christ. Wherefore, just as we receive and preach the five General Councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and Constantinople (II.), which all the churches of Christ approve and follow, so we receive with equal veneration, as following in their footsteps, and as their interpreter, the Holy Sixth Council lately held in the imperial city under the pious auspices of your Serenity; and we declare it worthily numbered with them, as congregated by one and the same grace of God; and we decree that those priests of the Church of Christ, who faithfully assembled in it, are to be numbered among the holy fathers and doctors of the Church."

Thirty years after the celebration of the Sixth Council, the emperor Philippicus Bardanes, led by the predictions

of a Monothelite astrologer, undertook to infuse new life into the dying heresy, and during the two years of his reign, the orthodox had much to suffer. But Monothelitism soon ceased to subsist as a separate heresy, its followers incorporating themselves with their cousins, the Eutychians (1).

It has been asserted that the *Acts* of the Sixth Council were vitiated by the Monothelites. If we could receive that opinion, the defence of Pope Honorius, which we shall undertake in the next chapter, would certainly be much simplified, for by far the strongest argument against his orthodoxy is deduced from the anathema pronounced against him, according to these *Acts*, by the fathers of the Council. However, the weight of evidence is in favor of the genuineness of the *Acts* as they have come down to us. It is certain that the *Acts* which we possess are the same that the Papal legates brought from Constantinople, and it is not to be supposed that the Monothelites would have been able to palm off vitiated copies upon the legates. Supposing, which is not at all likely, that the legates would have received the copies destined for the Holy See from the hands of heretics, the error would have surely been discovered upon their arrival at Rome, unless we believe that they were asleep during that important moment when the Council was anathematizing the Monothelites and all who aided them. And it would be something unique in the annals of falsification of codices, which annals are quite extensive, if the Monothelites were so lucky as to see their work alone survive, and the Catholics so unfortunate as to possess not even one codex of the genuine *Acts*. Again, we learn from the letters which Pope Leo II. sent to Constantine Pogonatus, to the Spanish king Ervigius, and to the bishops of Spain, that this Pontiff was fully persuaded that Honorius had been condemned by the Sixth Council. The Seventh General Council manifested the same belief. In the Eighth Council was read an allocution delivered by Pope Adrian II. to a Roman Synod, and in that document the Pontiff affirmed that the Holy See

(1) Mosheim and other more recent writers have contended that when Monothelitism was banished from Constantinople, it found a home among the fastnesses of Mount Lebanon, and seduced the heroic Maronites from the faith of Rome. Mosheim even asserts that St. Maro himself was a Monothelite. For a refutation of Mosheim in this matter, see PALMA: *Lectures*, chap. 70, Cent. 7.

had consented to what was done against Honorius in the Sixth Council. Baronio is convinced that the *Acts* were vitiated, and he names the culprit, the patriarch Theodore of Constantinople. According to the great annalist, Theodore erased his own name from among those of the condemned, and substituted that of Honorius. For, he says, in the Sixth Council all the Monothelite patriarchs were condemned by name ; yet that of Theodore does not occur. We know he was a Monothelite, for Anastasius tells us (1) that Constantine told the fathers of the Council that Theodore had subscribed to the Profession of Faith issued by Macarius. This argument is specious, but it seems to have escaped the observation of Baronio that the Council named the *dead* patriarchs, to condemn the heretical ones, and to put the names of the faithful ones in the diptychs. But it did not name the *living*, unless they had shown themselves pertinacious in heresy, and of this obstinacy there is no proof in the case of Theodore. He was absent from the Council, Constantine having expelled him from his see, and we do not know that he was cited by the fathers. The assertion of Anastasius as to Theodore's subscription to the doctrine of Macarius is corroborated by no other authority, and even if he had signed it, we need not therefore conclude that he should have been condemned by name in the Council. He might not have been obstinate, and might have been awaiting the decision of a General Council. And it is no light argument that such was his case, that he was afterwards restored to his see by the same anti-Monothelite Constantine who had deposed him, and that the restoration was made without his offering a new Profession of Faith. Finally, Theodore could not have interpolated the *Acts* which the legates brought to Rome. The legates left Constantinople a few months after the termination of the Council, and Theodore was not called from exile to his see until the death of the intruder George, which did not occur, according to Theophanes, until three years later.

Before we close this chapter on the Sixth Council, we

(1) *Life of Agatho.*

would say a few words as to a conclusion drawn from its *Acts* by Bossuet (1), in support of the Gallican theory of the supremacy of a General Council over the Roman Pontiff. The Sixth Council formally condemned the Monothelites, although the Popes Martin I. and Agatho had already launched their anathemas against them. But where was the necessity, asks the bishop of Meaux, of a condemnation by the Council, if the decision of the Roman Pontiff was definitive? Again, the Council submitted the *Dogmatic Epistle* of Agatho to an examination; therefore, the fathers claimed the right to judge the Pope. And the very anathema launched against Pope Honorius shows that the Council regarded the Roman Pontiff as subjected to its jurisdiction. To this opinion of Bossuet, we first oppose the epistle of Agatho to Pogonatus, which was read in the 4th *Action*. In it the Pontiff declares that he observes all that was defined by his predecessors and by the General Councils, and that he studies "that of those things which have been regularly defined, nothing shall be diminished, added, or changed, but shall be preserved intact, both in word and meaning." He then speaks of the instructions given to his legates, and says that "they were enjoined not to presume to add or change anything; but to simply narrate the tradition of this Apostolic See, as it has been established by the preceding Apostolic Pontiff." Had the Council regarded itself as superior to the Pope, would it not have resented such instructions? But Agatho goes on to explain why he wishes nothing to be changed or added: "Peter received the spiritual sheep of the Church from the Redeemer of all, with a triple injunction to feed them. By the favor of his protection, this Apostolic Church has never deviated in any way from the path of truth; and the whole Catholic Church of Christ, and the General Councils, have followed his authority in all things, as that of the Prince of all the Apostles." Asserting, therefore, the inerrability of his See, Agatho could not have submitted his definitions to the examination of the Council. We can also adduce the Synodical Epistle sent by Agatho and the Roman Synod to the Council. In

(1) *Defence of the Declaration*, p. 2, b. 12, c. 24.

this letter, after an assertion of the constant freedom from error enjoyed by the Roman See, the Pontiff and synodal fathers say, "This is our perfect science, that with our whole mind we preserve the limits of that Catholic and Apostolic faith which the Apostolic See has always held and delivered . . . . . you are not to dispute about uncertainties, but to proffer certain and immutable things in a compendious definition . . . . . We therefore receive as concordant with our Apostolic faith, as co-priests and co-ministers of the same faith, as spiritual brethren and our fellow bishops, all those who sincerely wish to teach what is contained in this Profession of Faith drawn up by our humility. But those who will not acknowledge these things, we look upon as enemies of the Catholic and Apostolic faith, and guilty of perpetual condemnation; and unless they will have corrected themselves, we shall not suffer such to enter the society of our humility." Had the Sixth Council regarded as illegitimate the claims here put forth, it would assuredly have protested against them, but, on the contrary, it acknowledged the supreme authority of Pope Agatho. Writing to the Pontiff, the Council ascribes the crushing of Monothelitism to his epistle, and acknowledges the letter as an emanation from the prince of the Apostles: "We regard as divinely sent from the supreme height of the Apostles, the letter sent by your Blessedness to the most pious emperor, through which we have repressed the lately arisen heretical sect of multifold error." And in its letter to Pope Leo, successor to Agatho, the Council avows its obligation to obey the dictates of St. Peter: "We have looked upon the Prince of the Apostolic chair, Peter, the bishop of the first See, divinely showing to the eyes of our souls the mystery of the whole dispensation . . . . . For the whole Christ was described in those his sacred letters, which with willing minds we have sincerely received, and as though they were Peter himself, have taken to the embrace of our souls." And in its epistle to the emperor, the Council says of the epistle of Pope Agatho: "The parchment and ink were seen, and through Agatho Peter spoke." As for the examination of Agatho's epistle, which Bossuet contends was made by the Council, the same

reply may be given that we gave to a similar objection in the case of the epistle of St. Leo to the Council of Chalcedon. An inquisitorial and judicial examination is one thing, an investigation for the sake of information is another; the latter, not the former, was undertaken by the Council. As to the condemnation of Monothelitism by the Council, even after the Pontifical definitions, there was no superfluity of action in such a repetition. It was necessary for the Council to manifest the adhesion of the Church to the doctrine taught by the Apostolic See, and that could be done in no better way than by a condemnation of the heresy in question. It was proper also to show the Monothelites, in the most solemn manner possible, that the whole Church was against them. The anathema launched against Pope Honorius does not prove, as Bossuet asserts, that the Pontiff, as such, was subject to the jurisdiction of the Council. For, as we shall show in the next chapter, if Honorius erred, he did so as a private individual. We contend that he did not err at all, and the absurdities which follow from the supposition that a Pope, even as a private individual, can fall into heresy, form a good argument for those who believe in his personal, as well as official, freedom from liability to error in matters of faith. We will now proceed to examine into the alleged heresy of Pope Honorius, and among the errors of Bossuet and his school in this matter, it will be seen that a place must be accorded to the assertion that the Sixth Council regarded, and anathematized, Honorius as a heretic.

---

## CHAPTER XXXV.

### THE ALLEGED HERESY OF POPE HONORIUS.

Of the few illustrative cases adduced by the opponents of Papal infallibility to support their theory, two stand out in bold relief, for they alone merit any serious attention. Of these, we think that the case of Pope Liberius affords no real

difficulty to the impartial student, but we must admit that the case of Honorius is not so simple. In it, we have to deal with letters in which our opponents discover doctrines manifestly heretical; we hear the clear voice of an Ecumenical Council anathematizing the Pontiff in the same breath that it draws when condemning those whom we willingly abjure. Such a case is not to be hastily treated. It has occupied the best minds of the two schools, into which, before the last General Council, our theologians and historians were divided. Anything new bearing upon it will probably never be discovered; every document has been thoroughly criticized, every argument well ventilated, every prejudice analyzed. To Protestant authors the cause of Honorius has been a mine which needed little delving for the extraction of its treasures. Most attractive was the picture of a Roman Pontiff teaching a doctrine which the veriest tyro in theology knows to be anti-Catholic; yet more entrancing was the scene in which was heard a General Council, confirmed by a Pope, and therefore, to all Catholics, infallible, branding as a "heretic" one of those Heads of the Church generally regarded as themselves infallible. Ultramontanes and Gallicans alike should be overwhelmed by such a fact, and it was well developed. Gallicanism has now passed into the realms of history; the Council of the Vatican has rendered it forever a thing of the past. But, just as no one could be styled a dogmatic theologian, if, though knowing what is the teaching of the Church, he were unable to prove its soundness, so no one will be well versed in the meaning of history, unless he connects his facts with their causes, consequences, and correlatives—unless, in fact, he is able to reason upon them. It is not sufficient, for one who wishes to converse intelligently upon matters of Church history, to know that the Church teaches that no Pope can err in faith; he must be able to prove that no Pope has ever so erred. With the first argument he will convince his own brethren; but it is only with the second, furnished by matter-of-fact history, that, very frequently, he will convince an outsider. For this reason, we enter upon the defence of Pope Honorius.

Of the many Catholic authors who have defended Honorius from the charge of heresy, we may first cite Cardinal Baronio. His theory is that of the vitiation of the *Acts* of the Sixth Council. If that idea were tenable, our case would require no further defence, but, as we have seen in the last chapter, the *Acts* must be accepted as authentic. The eminent annalist then asserts that the Sixth Council declared that it condemned the Monothelites according to the tenor of the sentence of Pope Agatho; we know, however, that Agatho did not proscribe Honorius. Therefore, concludes Baronio, the Synod did not condemn the Pontiff. Unfortunately, this argument must also be excluded, because Agatho only mentioned the originators of the heresy, while the Synod went further, and, to say nothing of Honorius, condemned Macarius, Stephen, and Polychronius. The next argument of Baronio is deduced from the silence of the Papal legates while a Roman Pontiff was being condemned, and it would mean much if adduced against an adversary holding that Honorius was anathematized as a formal heretic, but it has no weight with one who acknowledges that the Pontiff was guilty merely of false prudence and of giving comfort to a budding heresy. Again, these particular legates might have been culpably silent in such an emergency, for while we cannot agree with Alexandre that they were "idiots," yet we know from Agatho's epistle to Pogonatus, read in the fourth *Action* of the Sixth Council, that the Pope excused himself for sending men so little versed in theological lore, pleading as a reason the dearth of science just then prevalent in Italy, owing to the terrible state of political and social matters (1).

The erudite Jesuit Garnier, in his 2nd Dissertation affixed to his edition of the *Diurnal of the Roman Pontiffs*, defends Honorius from the charge of heresy, but contends that he was condemned for "imprudent economy" in the Monothelite matter, inasmuch as he wished for silence as to the number of operations, when the good of religion demanded that the two operations should be openly de-

(1) The Pontiff also says that his legates are not to argue, but to see that Monothelitism, already condemned by Rome, be condemned by the Council.

fended. Speaking of Baronio's theory, Garnier says, "Baronio satisfied few learned men, although he piously brought to bear, upon what he believed the only possible way of defending Honorius, the entire strength of his great genius and learning." A great number of authors lay the principal stress of their defence upon the fact that the epistles of Honorius were private, and not dogmatic. Their views are well expressed in an anonymous work cited by Alexandre (1) entitled *Gaul Vindicated*. "However the case of Honorius may be regarded," says this writer, "it is certain that his error, if any there were, would not injure our cause; for who does not know that the letters of Honorius to Pyrrhus and Sergius, on account of which he is accused of heresy, were private, not public and dogmatic, and that in them Honorius defined nothing, but simply manifested his mind and private opinion? That Popes may err in such epistles, I do not deny, nor does it enter the question; for everything done or said by a Pontiff is not an oracle or above human frailty; only when he acts as Pontiff, or, as the schools put it, when he teaches *ex cathedra*. . . . . The letters sent by Honorius to Sergius were private, not addressed to the faithful, nor do they decide anything; for although, by the law of contraries, there should be or not be two wills and two operations in Christ, yet Honorius wishes neither view to be asserted, but only two with their own operations, which surely is not a decision, but a leaving the question unsettled. However, not in every case, nor in every writing, do we proclaim the Pontiff infallible; but only when he acts as Pontiff and teacher of the Church, that is, when he performs some act which pertains to a Pontiff alone, and such is not the writing or answering of letters, for that is permitted to every bishop, and to every private person. For as this privilege of infallibility is meant for the public good of the Church, God wished to assign it to the office, not to the person, and to have it present, only when a Pontifical duty was being performed." The reader will find in Mamachi (2) a list of the authors who have treat-

(1) *Seventh Cent.*, dissert. I., in note 1.

(2) *Origins and Antiquities*, tom. 6.

ed all sides of this question, We shall, however, draw his attention to Orsi (1), to Thomassin (2), to Alexandre (3), and to Palma's *Lectures*. The pious and scholarly Cardinal La Luzerne (4) has presented the Gallican view of the matter in his usual masterly and courteous style, and as that view has been put forth by no one, not even by Bossuet, in so forcible a way, we shall take occasion to notice his objections. The opinion of Alexandre is presented in the propositions that Honorius was condemned in the Sixth Council; that he was justly condemned as an "author of Monothelitism;" that, however, he can be "truly and piously" excused of heresy. If there appears to be a contradiction between the second and third of these propositions, it is to be noted, in justice to Alexandre, that in his treatment of the second proposition, he leans to the theory of Garnier, and does not follow out the idea conveyed by the word "author."

Proceeding now to the defence of Pope Honorius from the charge of heresy, we must first observe that we find it difficult to account for the energy displayed by Gallican writers in this matter. Unlike Protestants, they were in no position of rebellion to Church authority, were actuated by no hatred to the Papacy, and hence were not naturally led to attack Rome for any reason or for no reason. What had they to gain? Their favorite theory of the fallibility of the Roman Pontiff could not be strengthened by proving the heresy of Honorius, for it is certain that the epistles to Sergius and Pyrrhus were private and not dogmatic. Unless they could show that these letters were sent by the Pontiff as dogmatic teaching, intended for the whole Church of Christ, their labor would be vain. That the letters were private, we now proceed to show. And in the first place, the adversaries of Honorius should bear the burden of producing proof in this matter, not we, for when a man in power writes a letter, no more than that of any other person is it presumed to be official, unless it carries with itself the marks of official character. Thus,

(1) *Authority of the Roman Pontiff*, p. 1, b. 1.

(3) *As above*.

(2) *Dissert. 12 on Councils*. (4) *Declaration of the French Clergy in 1682*, p. 3, c. 17.

when an absolute monarch issues an edict, its phraseology will reveal that obedience is demanded; when a constitutional sovereign emits a decree, the paper is countersigned by the minister whose department it concerns. Now, in the letters of Honorius and in the circumstances of their issuance, not only is there an absence of any indication of their being official, but there is positive evidence of their private character (1). He tells Sergius, "that no one should presume to teach one or two operations in Christ, when neither Scriptural nor Apostolic letters, nor a Synodical examination are seen to have determined the matter." Such language could not be used by a Pontiff, if he were teaching whether or not there were two operations. Again, in accordance with the doctrine that it is not by *inspiration*, but by *assistance*, that the Holy Ghost preserves the defining authority in the Church from error, the Roman Pontiffs have always, when defining doctrine, had the previous aid, either of a Synod or of some of the Roman clergy, whose duty it was to thoroughly examine the matter. In this very question of Monothelitism, the Pontiffs who succeeded Honorius (2), viz., John IV., Theodore, Martin, and Agatho, took no action until they had held Synods. That Honorius held no Synod, and took no counsel with his clergy, before writing these letters, is patent from the very disputes as to his meaning which were rampant so shortly after his death; some of his advisers must have been living, if he had used any. And the Sixth Council never speaks of the letters of

(1) In his *Animadversion* on the propositions of Alexandre, Roncaglia asserts, as a proof of the private nature of these letters, that they were unknown in the West up to the time of the Sixth Council, which certainly could not be the case with dogmatic epistles. He says they must be regarded as having been long unknown in Africa, from the fact that the Synods of Carthage, Numidia, and Mauritania, held against the Monothelites, anathematized Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, but said nothing of Honorius. A denunciation of some kind against Honorius would have been made, as was afterwards done in the Sixth Council, had his epistles been known. As for Europe, he asks how it was that under the Pontificates of Honorius, Severinus, John IV., and Theodore, no Monothelite quoted them as did his brethren in the East. This argument would be a good one, for forty-seven years elapsed between the writing of the letters and the meeting of the Council, if history were in its favor. But it will not hold as to the African churches, for the quoted Synods were held during the Pontificate of John IV. (639-641), and the letters were written in 633. Considering the nature of the times, six or seven years of ignorance as to the existence of the letters would not prove their non-official character. Important communications between the churches were often years on the way. When the African fathers sent their legates to Constantinople to inquire into the Nicene canons cited by Pope Zosimus, they were three years absent. Nor will Roncaglia's argument hold good as to Europe. It is strange that he should have forgotten that Pope John IV. sent a letter to the emperor complaining of Pyrrhus for "scandalizing the entire West," by spreading far and wide the letters of Honorius, and interpreting them in a Monothelite sense. We shall have occasion to notice this letter hereafter.

(2) Severinus reigned only two months.

Honorius as ‘ Synodical,’ while it applies the epithet in the case of all the epistles which were indited after or in a Synod, as those of Sophronius, Sergius, and Macarius. But not only did Honorius send these letters in a thoroughly unofficial manner; in the documents themselves there is nothing to indicate that they were meant for others than Sergius and Pyrrhus. When, however, the Pontiffs send dogmatic epistles, they signify that these are meant for the Universal Church. Finally, we have a most conclusive proof that the letters of Honorius were private, not dogmatic, in the epistle of Pope Agatho to the emperor, which was read in the fourth *Action* of the Sixth Council: “This is the rule of the true faith, which, both in happy and in evil days, this Apostolic Church of Christ, the spiritual mother of your most tranquil empire, has strongly held and defended; that Church which, by the grace of the omnipotent God, is proved to have never wandered from the path of Apostolic tradition, or to have depravely succumbed to heretical innovations . . . . according to the divine promise of Christ our Lord, the Saviour, which He made to the Prince of His Apostles. . . . Let your tranquil Clemency therefore reflect that the Lord and Saviour of all, whose faith this is, who promised that the faith of Peter should never fail, ordered him to confirm his brethren; and it is known to all that this has always been confidently done by the predecessors of my Little-ness, the Apostolic Pontiffs, whose footsteps that Little-ness, although unequal to the task, desires to follow, on account of the office conferred upon it by the divine mercy.” Now Pope Agatho was aware of the prejudice subsisting against Honorius in the East, on account of these very letters. Had they been the dogmatic teachings of a successor of that Blessed Peter whose faith could never fail, and not the mere private utterances of an individual, would Agatho have been so shameless as to boast that his predecessors had never failed in confirming their brethren? No—the Pontiff knew, and the Council, which heard and approved this epistle, knew, that whatever the letters of Honorius contained of imprudence, or even, if you will, of heresy, was from the mind of the individual Honorius, and was not the authorita-

tive presentation of a doctrine on the part of the universal teacher. Here then we might conclude the defence of Pope Honorius, for it is plain that the prerogatives of the Holy See are not affected by his letters to the Monothelites. But it is well to ascertain, so far as the light of history will guide us, whether indeed one of the Roman Pontiffs was personally guilty of heresy. The accusations against Honorius are based upon the contents of his letters to Sergius; let us therefore read and examine the documents.

From the first letter, read in the twelfth *Action* of the Sixth Council, our adversaries select the following passages: "We have received the letters of your Fraternity, and by them have learned of the introduction of new disputes as to terms by a certain Sophronius (once a monk, and now, as we hear, made bishop of Jerusalem) against our brother Cyrus, bishop of Alexandria, who teaches to the converts from heresy one operation of our Lord Jesus Christ; and having examined the copy of the letter sent to the same Sophronius, and seen that your Fraternity has sufficiently, providently, and circumspectly written, we praise the remover of a novelty in speech (1), which might cause scandal to the simple-minded . . . . . We ought not to wrangle about these ecclesiastical dogmas (2), which neither the Synodal nor canonical authorities seem to have explained, that is, to presume to preach one or two wills in Christ God, when neither Scripture nor Apostolic letters, nor a Synodical examination, held for the purpose, have appeared to decide. . . . . That our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son and Word of God, by whom all things were made, is Himself one, operating divine and human things, the sacred writings plainly show. Whether, however, on account of the works of the Humanity and Divinity, one or two operations ought to be proclaimed and understood, these things do not belong to us; let us leave them to the grammarians, who are accustomed to display to the young their choice derivations of words. . . . . We exhort your Fraternity to preach with us, as we do with one mind with you, in orthodox faith and Catholic

(1) "*Novitatem vocabuli.*"

(2) "*Dogmata hæc ecclesiastica retorquere.*"

unity,—avoiding the use of the introduced terms, one or two operations—that there is one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Living God, most true God in two Natures, operating divinely and humanly.” And in another part of the same epistle, the Pontiff says: “Whence we acknowledge one will in our Lord Christ, because the Divinity assumed our nature, not our fault; that nature, certainly, which was created before the sin, not that which was vitiated after the fall. There was not then assumed by the Saviour a vitiated nature, which fought with the law of His mind. For another law in His members, or a different contrary will, was not in the Saviour.” These are the words of Pope Honorius, which, considered together with the action of the Sixth Council in his regard, and the “weakness of the defence,” caused the learned and sincere Cardinal de la Luzerne, as he himself says, to abandon his early opinion that the Pontiff fell into a simple error of fact, and to range himself with those who charge Honorius with heresy.

It has been contended that this epistle was corrupted by the Monothelites; that, in the last of the quoted passages, Honorius did not say, “one will,” but “a new will.” But Pope John IV., in his *Apology* for Honorius, the Popes Leo II. and Adrian II., and the 6th, 7th, and 8th Councils, accepted the passage as it stands. Nor do we wish to reject it, for there is not a more orthodox passage in the whole patrology. Honorius plainly asserts that as Christ, in becoming man, assumed our nature, as it was before the fall of Adam, He did not incur any of our frailties, and hence had in his soul and members no two contrary and conflicting wills and inclinations, as have those who bear the effects of original sin. But there is no need for us to thus paraphrase the text; its intended meaning is obvious on the instant that the eye strikes the sentence. But La Luzerne answers that Honorius cannot be understood as speaking of the one will of Christ's Humanity, as it would be absurd to suppose in man two faculties of will. While no theologian has ever been guilty of this absurdity, yet all, from the Apostle down, have ever spoken of the law in the members disputing the empire of the soul with the law in the mind. This, and

nothing else, is the meaning of Honorius: "There was not assumed by the Saviour a vitiated nature, which fought with the law of His mind. For another law in His members, or a different contrary will, was not in the Saviour." As Palma remarks, the sin of Monothelitism consisted in its explanation of the Eutychian mistakes upon the two wills and operations in Christ; for the Eutychian heresy, when developed as to the will and operation of our Lord, inevitably brought out the assertion of one will and one operation. Hence, St. Leo the Great said to his legate Julian, "His flesh was not of another nature than ours, nor in a way different from that of other men did He receive His soul, which excelled, not in diversity of kind, but in sublimity of virtue; for He had nothing contrary in His flesh, nor did a discord of desires generate a strife of wills. His bodily senses flourished without the law of sin, and the truth of His affections, being under the control of the Deity and of His mind, was neither tempted by allurements, nor yielded to attacks." After quoting this, and a similar passage taken from St. Leo's epistle to Flavian, Palma well demands whether, if it was right for St. Leo to thus urge the Eutychians, Honorius could not, in almost the same controversy, speak as he did about the one human will of Christ.

La Luzerne asserts that Pope Honorius, in his epistles to Sergius, talks as though it were a matter of complete indifference whether one or two wills be proclaimed; else, why enjoin silence as to the terms? It is true that the Pontiff advised silence, but it was to be practiced only until competent authority should decide the matter, and to avoid scandal to the simple-minded. He by no means signified that he did not believe it necessary to acknowledge two operations in Christ. On the contrary, he said to Sergius: "We must confess that both Natures are joined in the one Christ by a natural unity, operators and operating in communion with each other; the Divine indeed, operating the things that are of God, and the Human working the things which are of the flesh; not dividedly, or confusedly, or convertibly, teaching that the Nature of God is converted into man, or the Nature of man into that of God, but confessing

the integral differences of the Natures." Can the Catholic doctrine be stated in clearer terms? And before Honorius spoke of the advisability of silence, he told the patriarch that "we ought not to define one or two operations, but instead of 'one operation,' as some say, we ought to truly avow one operator, Christ the Lord in the nature of each; and instead of 'two operations,' removing the term 'two operations,' we ought rather to teach the two Natures, that is, the Divinity and the Humanity, in the One Person of the Only Son of God, each operating its own, inconfusedly, undividedly, and inconvertibly." There is no need of paraphrasing or of explaining these passages. The Catholic doctrine as to the two wills and operations is so plainly stated, that far from helping the cause of the Monothelites, the heresy is completely subverted by them, for, "each operates its own, inconfusedly, undividedly, and inconvertibly," in which phrase there is certainly not only no implication of any *Theandric* operation, but an explicit assertion of two distinct ones.

But although it is plain that the epistles of Honorius are thoroughly orthodox, there remains as evidence against the Pontiff the condemnatory action of the Sixth Council. We have shown in the last chapter that the theory of Baronio as to the vitiation of the *Acts* is untenable. It therefore becomes necessary to reconcile the orthodoxy of Honorius with the clearly denunciatory language used by the Council against him. In the 13th *Action*, the fathers say: "Reconsidering the dogmatic epistles which were written by Sergius, once patriarch of this imperial city, which may God preserve, both to Cyrus, who was then bishop of Phasis, and to Honorius, once Pope of ancient Rome; similarly also the epistle from him, that is, Honorius, written to the same Sergius, and finding them entirely different from the Apostolic teachings, and the definition of the Holy Councils and of all reliable fathers, and following the false doctrines of heretics; we in every way reject them, and execrate them as noxious to the soul. And we have decreed to throw out from the Church of God the names of those whose impious dogmas we execrate, that is, of Sergius, once bishop of this

imperial city, which may God preserve, who undertook to write on this wicked dogma; of Cyrus of Alexandria, of Pyrrhus, of Peter, and of Paul, who died in the bishopric of this city, which may God preserve, and who thought similarly to them; . . . We have also decided to eject, together with these, from the Holy Catholic Church of God, and to anathematize, Honorius, who was Pope of ancient Rome, because we find, from the writings he gave to Sergius, that in all things he held the latter's view, and confirmed the impious dogmas." In the 16th *Action*, the fathers exclaimed, "To the heretic Sergius, anathema; to the heretic Honorius, anathema; to the heretic Theodore of Pharan, anathema." In the 18th *Action*, they cried, "To Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus, anathema; to Apollinaris and Severus, anathema; to Sergius and Honorius, anathema; . . . to all heretics, anathema; to all who taught, teach, or will teach, one will and one operation in the dispensation of our Lord Jesus Christ, anathema." In the Prosphonic, or Acclamatory Address to the emperor, they say, "We have thrown out of the ecclesiastical limits superfluous novelties of speech, and their inventors, and deservedly anathematize them; that is, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter, who held these of Constantinople, and also Cyrus, who was bishop of Alexandria, and with them Honorius, who was bishop of Rome, because he followed them." Finally, in the Synodical epistle to Pope Agatho, the fathers say, "We have afflicted with anathema, according to the sentence already pronounced upon them by your letter, Theodore, bishop of Pharan, Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, Paul, Pyrrhus, and Peter." The action of the Sixth Council certainly tells strongly against the fair fame of Honorius; the persistent association of his name with those of such noted heresiarchs as Eutyches, Dioscorus, Sergius, and Pyrrhus, assuredly indicates on the part of the fathers of the Council, a feeling of great bitterness towards his memory, while the explicit use of the term, "heretic" in his regard, would appear to settle the question. And nevertheless, this action of the Council does not prove that Honorius was a heretic. The mere application of the term "heretic" does not show that the indi-

vidual designated did not defend the orthodox doctrine. What then did the Sixth Council mean by branding Honorius with such a stigma? For stigma the name of heretic certainly was, and in those days a terrible one. There is no need of conjecture as to the meaning of the fathers; their meaning and object are explained by those who were well acquainted with both. Pope Leo II. confirmed the *Acts* of this Council, after hearing from the Papal legates all that had been done therein, and he tells us that Honorius was condemned for weakness and neglect; in fine, as a favorer or helper of heresy,—a terrible reproach, indeed, for one in his position to receive, but very different from that of formal heresy. In his confirmatory epistle, sent to Constantine Pogonatus, Pope Leo says, “We also anathematize the inventors of the new error, that is, Theodore, bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, ensnarers, rather than guides, of the church of Constantinople; and also Honorius, who did not illumine this Apostolic Church with the doctrine of Apostolic tradition, but allowed it, while immaculate, to be stained by profane betrayal.” And in his epistle to the bishops of Spain, the same Pontiff says, “Those, however, who contended against the purity of Apostolic doctrine, departing, have indeed been visited with eternal condemnation; that is, Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, Constantinopolitans; with Honorius who did not extinguish the incipient flame of heretical dogma, as befitted Apostolic authority, but, by neglect, nourished it.”

The conduct of Honorius had greatly helped the cause of the Monothelites. He had conceded to Sergius that which the cunning patriarch foresaw would be most opportune for the dubious fortunes of his party, namely, silence as to the terms “one or two” operations. It was not a question of terminology, but of a truth, for the specification of which those numerals were necessary. The use of those terms was even more to be required than, three hundred years before, had been the use of the word *homoousion* in the matter of Arianism; for in those days, there were many who disliked the word, but held the orthodox doc-

trine, while in the case of the wills of our Lord, if a man rejected the "two," it was patent that he admitted but "one." The imprudence of Honorius is the more remarkable in that he really gained nothing for the cause of quiet, by the concession of silence, since, at the very time he allowed it, he insisted upon the teaching of the true doctrine, couched in terms very nearly as clear to the simplest mind as those that were permitted to be kept in abeyance. He meant well, but he should have remembered the words of Cælestine I. to the French bishops: "I fear lest to be silent as to this matter, may be to connive at it; I fear lest they talk the more, who permit such things to be said. In such matters, silence is suspicious. . . . . The cause is properly our own, if we favor error by silence." As he yielded to a false idea of prudence, to what was really a moral cowardice, the fathers of the Sixth Council regarded Honorius as a Pontiff who had neglected his duty, and who therefore became worthy of censure, even of anathema.

The secretary employed by Pope Honorius to draw up the epistles to Sergius was a certain abbot John, and St. Maximus Martyr tells us, in his letter to Marinus and in his dispute with Pyrrhus, that John thus spoke to a mutual friend, the abbot Anastasius, about the Pontiff's words: "We said there was one will in the Lord, not in the Divinity and Humanity, but in the Humanity alone. When Sergius wrote that some were asserting two contrary wills in Christ, we answered that Christ did not have two contrary wills, of the flesh, that is, and the spirit, as we have after the fall, but one only, which naturally affected the Humanity." Cardinal La Luzerne rejects the authority of abbot John, as of one anxious to make his own apology. Such reasoning is not only frivolous, but unworthy of the eminent author. The high-toned and sincere-minded prelate must have been deeply affected by the society of the skeptical courtiers who formed but too large a part of the court-circles of Louis XVIII. and Charles X., when he came to the conclusion that no man can ever be heard in his own defence. The unsupported word of an accused person is of no value

when contradicted by positive evidence ; but when it tallies minutely with the testimony before the tribunal, it is of great account. And the assertion of the Papal secretary is corroborated, as we have seen, by the letters themselves.

No person could have better understood the letters of Honorius than Pope John IV., who was elected six years after they were written. His letter to the Emperor Constantine, son of Heraclius, is so pointed, and so illustrative of our subject, that we shall transcribe a good portion of it : "All the West is scandalously disturbed because our brother, the patriarch Pyrrhus, has sent letters hither and thither, teaching certain new doctrines, outside the rule of faith, and ascribing the same views to Pope Honorius of holy memory, whereas such were entirely foreign to the mind of the Catholic Pontiff. That your Benignity may be acquainted with the whole affair, which occurred only a little while ago, I shall narrate it. The patriarch Sergius, of revered memory, informed the aforesaid Roman Pontiff, of holy memory, that certain persons were teaching two contrary wills in our Redeemer, the Lord Jesus Christ. The aforesaid Pope learning this, he replied that as our Saviour was one and indivisible (1), so He was conceived and born in a manner wonderfully above that of the entire human race. As to the dispensation of His Incarnation, he also taught that our Redeemer, just as He was perfect God, so He was perfect Man ; and that, being born without sin, He renewed the pristine nobility of the image, which the first man lost by the fall. The Second Adam, therefore, was born, having no sin, either in His birth, or in His conversation with men. For the Word being made Flesh in the similitude of the flesh of sin, assumed all of ours, but took none of the vice of guilt which is derived from the fall. . . . . and therefore our Lord Jesus Christ deigned to have one will, natural to His Humanity, according to the original formation of Adam ; not two contrary wills, such as we feel we now have, who are born of the sin of Adam. . . . . Whence, knowing that in His birth and life there was no sin, we properly say, and truly avow,

1 The text has *monadicus*.

that there is one will in the holy dispensation of His Humanity; and we do not teach two contrary wills, of mind and of flesh, as rave some heretics, as though He were a mere man. . . . Therefore, my aforesaid predecessor, when teaching the mystery of the Incarnation of Christ, said that there were not in Him, as in us sinners, contrary wills of mind and of flesh. Converting this to their own views, some persons have suspected that he taught one will, of both Divinity and Humanity, which is in every way contrary to the truth." This letter of Pope John IV. goes so straight to the point, that La Luzerne finds but one way of escape, and that is, to throw it out of court altogether. And why? Because it was written by poor abbot John, once more Pontifical secretary. La Luzerne shuts his mind to the plain fact, that the responsibility and authority of a letter accrue not to the scribe, but to the master. Such reasoning as this would preclude the citation of nearly all public documents, for, in all probability, since the origin of written communications, not one per cent. of them has been executed by the hands that signed them. The cardinal also forgets that if abbot John is accountable for the letter of Pope John IV., he should also bear the responsibility of the letters of Honorius.

St. Maximus Martyr (1) in his *Dialogue with Pyrrhus*, furnishes us with the following defence of Honorius. "PYRR. What have you to say about Honorius, who, writing to my predecessor, openly taught one will in our Lord Jesus Christ? MAX. Who shall properly interpret the meaning of that epistle? He who drew it up, at the side of Honorius, and is yet living; among other good things, conspicuous for the pious teachings with which he has illumined the entire West? (2) Or shall we hear the Constantinopolitans, speaking from their hearts? PYRR. He who composed it. MAX. That same person, writing, this time, at the

(1) St. Maximus was one of the most strenuous opponents of Monothelitism. His *Dialogue with Pyrrhus* is an account of the dispute which the holy abbot held with the heresiarch, while the latter was in exile in Africa. When exiled by Constant to Byzla, he held a famous conference with the imperial emissaries, Theodosius, bishop of Casarea, and two patricians; afterwards, he held another before the emperor in the palace at Constantinople. His three disputations have come down to us and are among the most precious records of the time. The Monothelites thrice procured his exile: his right hand was chopped off, his tongue plucked out, and he finally died in his third exile in 657.

(2) Abbot John, whose authority La Luzerne would ignore.

side of Pope John, says to the divine Constantine, then emperor, 'We said there was one will in the Lord, not in the Divinity and Humanity, but in the Humanity alone. For when Sergius had written that some asserted two contrary wills in Christ, we replied that Christ did not have two contrary wills, in the flesh, that is, and in the spirit; but only one, which is naturally an essential note of His Humanity.' That it was thus, is evidently shown by the mention made of flesh and members, which cannot be attributed to the Divinity."

Anastasius the Librarian, in his Preface to John the Deacon, thus vindicates Honorius: "There has come to our hands an *Apology* of the Roman Pontiff, John IV., for Pope Honorius, who was asserted by calumniators to have written that there is but one will in our Lord Jesus Christ. I think that this Apology sufficiently excuses him, although the Sixth Council anathematized him as a heretic, and smote him, already judged by God, with the javelin of reprobation; for a man does not become a heretic because he is deceived by error, but when he chooses wrongly, and is contentiously pertinacious therein. But who is there to tell us whether he really wrote that epistle? . . . . Although we do not ignore that St. Maximus, in his letter to Marinus, tells us it was written by the most holy abbot John. But granted that he (Honorius) was the dictator, who will interrogate him upon it?"

We will now bring this dissertation to an end. We have seen that there is no heresy in the letters of Pope Honorius; that, even if there were, they are not dogmatic teachings of a Roman Pontiff, addressing the Universal Church, but simply the private utterances of the writer; that, finally, Honorius was not condemned by the Sixth Council for heresy, but for neglect of duty.

## CHAPTER XXXVI.

### THE TRULLAN OR "QUINISEXT" SYNOD.

This Synod, many of the canons of which were rejected by the Holy See, and to which the same authority has always refused the stamp of œcumenicity, is regarded by the Greek schismatics as an appendix of the Fifth and Sixth General Councils. Hence its name of "Quinisext." It is also styled "Trullan," from the fact of its having been held in a domical hall of the imperial palace at Constantinople, *troullos* being Lower Greek for *tholos*, a dome. It was convoked by the Emperor Justinian II., and the reason for its celebration is mentioned by its members in their Allocution to the sovereign: "Since the two Holy and Universal Synods (5th and 6th) edited no holy canons—unlike the other four Holy Universal Synods—by which men would be led to abandon an evil and abject manner of life, and to return to a better and higher one, . . . . . therefore we, assembled by order of your Piety in this ruling and God-revering city, have issued some holy canons." Where, asks Pagi (1) did the Greeks learn that a General Council must necessarily issue disciplinary canons? The date of the Trullan Synod is uncertain. Baronio contends that the year 692 is the right one, and his opinion is received by the erudite and critical Zaccaria (2); Alexandre adduces a plausible argument to show that 688 is the date. As to the presidency of the Synod, the eminent Oratorian assigns it to the Constantinopolitan patriarch Callinicus, and he is followed by Christian Lupus, who holds that the signature of Paul, the successor of Callinicus, which is read in the codices, was substituted for this latter prelate's, he having been regarded as an infamous man. Palma, after Pagi, remarks that this assertion of Lupus is gratuitous, and that, furthermore, it is certain that the patriarch Paul succeeded Callinicus in 686, and reigned until 693. Paul, therefore, as

(1) *Criticisms on Baronio*, y. 692, no. 8. (2) *Polemical History of Holy Celibacy*, c. 9.

the old codices testify, and as Blastres asserts (1), was presiding officer of the Trullan Synod.

Historians have differed as to the question whether or not any Papal legates attended this Synod. There ought to be no doubt in the matter, for it is certain that if any Pontifical legates had been on hand, they would have, by virtue of their office, taken precedence of the patriarch Paul, and presided over the assembly. Yet Balsamon asserts that the Synod was attended, "in the name of the whole Roman Synod," by Basil, metropolitan of Crete, and by the bishop of Ravenna; and furthermore, Balsamon adds that "there were present not only these, but the bishops of Thessalonica, Sardia, Heraclea in Thrace, and Corinth, who were the legates of the Pope" (2). That the learned and generally reliable Balsamon is here mistaken, is proved, firstly, in reference to the prelates of Thessalonica, Sardia, Heraclea, and Corinth, by the fact that the Synodical decrees were not subscribed by them. Where their signatures might have been placed, we read "The place of the Thessalonican (bishop)," &c., which shows that they were absent, and that the decrees, as was customary in such cases, were to be sent to them for subscription. As for Balsamon's assertion that Basil of Crete, who did subscribe, represented "the whole Roman Synod," this representation does not imply any legatine authority, in the proper sense of the term. Basil was at that time Papal *Apocrisiarius*, or ambassador, at the Byzantine court, and as such, represented, in some respects, "the whole Roman Synod," but that office did not qualify him, without a special delegation *ad hoc*, to act as Papal legate at a Council. Constantine Pogonatus, after the 6th Council, had in vain requested Pope Leo II. to give plenipotential powers to the Papal ambassador; Basil, therefore, possessed no legatine authority at the Trullan Synod. Anastasius the Librarian certainly informs us that "the Emperor Justinian having ordered a Council to meet in the imperial city, the legates of the Apostolic See came to it, and being deceived, sub-

(1) *Preface to the Nomocanon of Photius.* (2) *Commentary on the Nomocanon*

scribed." (1) But this passage also may be explained as referring to the nuncio Basil, who, with some other Papal ambassador, attended the Synod. Again, as Pagi observes, this same Basil is styled a legate in his subscription which is read in the 18th *Action* of the 6th Council. At that time also he was Papal *Apocrisiarius* at the Byzantine court, but in the 6th Council, as we learn from the letters of Pope Agatho and of Constantine Pogonatus, he was not joined with the regular legates.

The Greek schismatics entertain a particular esteem for this Trullan Synod, and affect to consider it as a continuation of the 6th Council, so as to be warranted in regarding it as œcumenical. Their reason is to be found in its anti-celibitic and other anti-Roman canons. Some of the canons, however, are most worthy of praise. Thus, the sixth prohibits priests, deacons, and subdeacons, from contracting matrimony after their ordination. The seventh rebukes the arrogance of such deacons as presumed, in certain localities, to take precedence of priests. The eighth commands the annual assembling of provincial Councils. The ninth forbids clerics to keep wine-shops. The fourteenth assigns 30 years as the age at which one may become a priest; 25 for a deacon; 40 for a deaconess. The twentieth suspends a bishop who dares to publicly teach in another diocese than his own. The twenty-sixth suspends a priest who, through ignorance, assists at an illicit marriage. The thirty-second condemns the Armenian custom of not mixing water with the wine to be consecrated. The thirty-third condemns the Armenian system of restricting the priesthood to a certain caste. The forty-second represses the wanderings of hermits, and orders them either to remain in their solitudes or to enter a monastery. The forty-fifth condemns the custom, in vogue in certain convents to this day, of dressing as a bride, and ornamenting with silks, &c., one about to take the veil. The sixty-fifth rebukes the superstition of dancing around bonfires at the time of the new moon. The sixty-eighth orders that copies of the Scriptures or of the works of the Fathers

(1) *Life of Pope Sergius I.*

be never sold to merchants, unless such copies are moth-eaten or otherwise ruined. The sixty-ninth debars all laymen from access to the sanctuary, the emperor alone, when offering gifts, excepted. The seventieth nullifies the marriage of an orthodox person with a heretic; but declares that the union of infidels is not to be dissolved, if the converted party wishes to cohabit as before, and if the infidel consents to cohabit "without injury to the Creator." The seventy-fifth ordains that "inordinate vociferations" be abolished in church-singing. The ninety-first subjects abortionists to the same penalties as homicides. The hundred-and-sixth excommunicates women who excessively dress and adorn their hair. The hundred-and-eighth declares adulterous the marriage of one betrothed to a third party.

Of the 102 Trullan canons, the Holy See rejected the following: The third, which received the eighty-five Apostolic Canons and the Apostolic Constitutions. The thirteenth, which attacked the law of clerical celibacy, and anathematized those who debarred priests and deacons from the society of their wives. The fifty-fifth, which condemned the Western custom of fasting on the Saturdays of Lent. The sixty-seventh, which condemned the eating of blood. The eighty-second, which prohibited the representation of the Saviour in the form of a Lamb.

Justinian II. sent the 102 Trullan canons to Pope Sergius I., begging their confirmation. What followed is best learned from the narrative of Anastasius the Librarian: "The blessed Pontiff would not satisfy the emperor, nor would he receive those volumes, or allow them to be read. He spurned them as of no authority, choosing rather to die, than to consent to error. . . . . Then the emperor sent his cruel sword-bearer, Zacchary, with an order to take the Pontiff to the imperial city. But the mercy of God interfering, and the blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, helping, the hearts of the Ravennese and Pentapolitan soldiers were touched, . . . and they would not allow the Pontiff to be removed from Rome. A great number of the soldiers having come together, the frightened Zacchary thought he might be killed, and hence he ordered the city gates to be closed, and trembling, took refuge

in the bed-chamber of the Pope, begging him with tears to be merciful. . . . . The Ravennese having entered the city by St. Peter's gate, the populace rushed to the Lateran, anxious to see the Pontiff. They then threatened to break down the doors if they were not opened. In despair Zachary now hid himself under the Pontiff's bed, and fairly lost his senses. But the Pope comforted him, telling him not to fear," &c. Anastasius then relates how Sergius was joyfully acclaimed by the people, and how the wretched minion of the Byzantine sovereign was opprobriously expelled from the Eternal City.

During the Pontificate of John VII. (705-707), Justinian II. again endeavored to procure a confirmation of the Trullan canons. The Pontiff, fearful of offending the emperor, did not openly condemn the obnoxious decrees, but, mindful of his duty, he did not receive them, but contented himself with returning them by the hands of the messengers who had brought them. The Pontificate of Sisinnius was of only twenty days' duration, but during that of his successor, Constantine (708-715), Justinian again pushed his favorite project. As we learn from Anastasius, the Pontiff visited Constantinople, and was most reverently received, but the silence of all Greek authors as to any confirmation of the obnoxious canons is a proof that the emperor did not gain his object. But the affectionate and reverential treatment accorded to Pope Constantine by Justinian seems to show that the Pontiff approved of such of the Trullan decrees as were not averse to the ancient decrees of the Holy See. That this was also according to the mind of Pope John VIII. (872-882), is gathered from Anastasius, in his Preface to the Latin version of the Seventh Council, which he dedicated to that Pontiff: "Your Apostolate discerning. . . . . the Church receives only such rules of the Holy Councils as are not contrary to the right faith and to approved customs and which in no way whatever conflict with the decrees of the Roman See. . . . . Therefore, those regulations which the Greeks declare to have been issued by the Sixth Council, and those of this Synod (7th), are so received by the chief See, that none of them are to be accepted which

are found to be contrary to the olden canons, to good morals, or to the decrees of the holy Pontiffs of this See.”

In fine, the Holy See has never approved of the 3d, 13th, 55th, 67th, and 82d Trullan canons. It must be remembered, also, that the Trullan Synod was a particular and national, not a General Council, and that hence, even though its canons had been approved by Rome, the discipline enforced by them would not therefore necessarily obtain in the Universal Church.

---

## CHAPTER XXXVII.

### ISLAMISM.

Mohammed was born at Mecca in the year 570, of poor, but respectable parents. Losing them when yet a child, he was brought up by his uncle, a merchant, and with him made many journeys through Syria and other lands. When he was about 25 years old, he married a rich widow named Kadijah, in whose service he had formerly been; and being thus enabled to abandon mercantile pursuits, he turned his energies to the acquirement of power. He had picked up from a Nestorian monk, named Sergius, a limited knowledge of the Mosaic law and of Christian doctrine, and this served him as a basis for his new religion. For fifteen years he retired during the period of a month to a cavern of Mt. Hera, where he pretended to receive revelations from God, through the Angel Gabriel. When he thought that the Arabs were pretty well prepared to listen to him, his wife and Sergius having meanwhile prepared the way by their wonderful stories, he announced that he had been sent to revive the ancient religion of Abraham, of Ishmael, of Jesus, and the prophets. He commenced his propaganda in the year 612, and continued it until his death in 631, leaving already in the profession of the new faith nearly the whole of Arabia. His successors continued his missionary career in the style he had adopted, that is, by fire and sword on the one hand,

and a pandering to human weakness on the other, until nearly all Asia and Africa acknowledged the truth of Islam. Very soon the new doctrine invaded Europe. The Byzantine empire, weakened by corruption, and still more by schism, offered but feeble resistance to the fanatical hordes who overran its fairest provinces. But through the indomitable energy of the Roman Pontiffs, the advancing waves of barbarism were checked by the Crusades, and, in more modern times, the Christian heroism of Poland and Hungary forced the followers of the prophet to abandon all designs on the West.

The doctrines of Mohammed are contained in the Koran, a book which the prophet said he received from the Angel Gabriel (1). According to him, the combined intellects of all the men in the world, aided by all the demons, could not have composed any one of its chapters; it is the greatest and most divine of all miracles. From amid a mass of fables, puerilities, and obscenities, taken, respectively, from the Jewish Talmud, the Apocryphal Gospels, and the Arabic romances of his day, we extract from the Koran the following principal doctrines of Mohammed: There is but one God, the Creator of the universe, the Judge of all men; God has no Son, for He needs nothing; when Jesus wished to be adored as God, He was rebuked by God, and excused Himself, saying, "Thou knowest that I have given to men only Thy commandment, that they should adore only Thee, my God and their own." (*Sura* 13 and 14.) Jesus was the Word of God (*Su.* 2); His Gospel was the Light and Confirmation of the Old Testament (*Su.* 12); He was divinely conceived, and born of Mary, a virgin sister of Moses (2), and at His birth, which took place under a palm tree, Mary

(1) The Koran is best known to English readers through the translation of George Sale whose deistical sympathies caused him to treat, in his preface, the Mohammedan doctrines with very great leniency. The best refutation of the Koran is that of Marracci (*Entire Text of the Koran*; Padua, 1698), professor of Arabic in the Propaganda at Rome, in the seventeenth century. This author makes no assertion that he does not corroborate with a text, and with testimonies from Arabic authors. Volney, in his *Voyage in Syria and Egypt* (made in 1783-85), although himself more than half infidel, says that the insensate teachings of the Koran are the natural cause of all the miseries experienced by the subjects of the Porte. Mohammed tells his followers, in the commencement of the book, that none of its points can admit of doubt, that a terrible punishment awaits all who will not accord it a full and hearty belief. One of the most salient characteristics of the Koran is its silence as to the interior virtues: there is no mention of the love of God and our neighbor, of mortification, of humility, of penitence.

(2) The reader need not be surprised at this anachronism, for the Koran is filled with such errors. Mohammed called himself "the prophet without learning."

fainted through pain, and was restored by eating of the fruit which Jesus, from the womb, called upon the palm to produce; He predicted His own death and resurrection; He was not crucified, God having substituted another in His place (*Su.* 29, 53, 11). The virgin Mary was devoted to God by her mother at the instant of her conception, and was the purest of all creatures; her maternity of Jesus was announced by the angels (*Su.* 29). Solomon received his wisdom from the demons, and was a great magician (*Su.* 1); Abraham received the law from God Himself, and built a temple at Mecca (*Su.* 2); God also gave the law to Moses (*Su.* 42); Ishmael was one of the prophets (*Su.* 11). The dead will arise at the last day (*Su.* 28). Paradise is a place of voluptuous enjoyment, a land watered by most limpid streams, and shaded by beautiful trees; the good who inhabit it are adorned with rings and bracelets, always have plenty to eat, and recline on magnificent couches; the region produces streams of sweet milk, the most generous of wines, and the purest of honey. But above all other joys, the houris are beautiful virgins, never deflowered by either men or devils, and are destined for the solace of the faithful (*Su.* 23, 28, 54, 57, 62, 65) (1). The wicked and unbelievers are to be tortured in everlasting fire (*Su.* 66). There is a Purgatory, and we should pray for the dead (*Su.* 29, 46). All living things came from one soul; men are derived from shade, demons from fire (*Su.* 15, 65) (2). Man is the victim of fate (*Su.* 50, 67). Adam fell, and hence came concupiscence into the world (*Su.* 30). The doctrines of the Koran are not to be disputed, and no proof is to be required of their truth; all questions about this book are to be left till the last day (*Su.* 9). The faithful are encouraged to battle for Islam; Paradise is only for the strong in war; those who fall in battle, are not said to die, but rather live in God (*Su.* 6); those who flee from the combat will be punished by eternal fire; especially against Christians should the true believers war; captives should be killed or

(1) Mohammed assigns a separate paradise to women, and it is remarkable that while he creates the houris for the delectation of men, he assigns no lovers to the gentle sex.

(2) Mohammed contradicts this doctrine in other places, saying that man was formed from the earth, and the demons from nothing.

reduced to slavery (1); the enemy who yields, is to be received into the faith; four out of the twelve months are to be devoted to war (*Su.* 6, 18, 19). Circumcision is commanded, but is not to be effected until the thirteenth year. A man may have several wives, according to his means, providing he is able to keep peace among them; wives may be repudiated or changed; one may not marry his sister, aunt, granddaughter, daughter-in-law, or two sisters (*Su.* 8, 9). An adulteress is to be imprisoned at home until death; a disobedient or sulky wife is to be whipped (*Ibi*). The word of an infidel has no value (*Su.* 6). The use of pork or of blood, and of wine, is prohibited (*Su.* 12, 3, 16). Frequent prayer, with the face turned towards Mecca, is enjoined; before it, if water is at hand, the face, neck, feet and hands, are to be washed; if there is no water, sand is to be used (*Su.* 3, 9). Friday is the special day for worship (*Su.* 72). Mohammed is more severe upon usury than are some Christian moralists (*Su.* 3). Revenge on an enemy is a sacred duty (*Su.* 60, 52). Once at least in his life every believer must make the pilgrimage to Mecca, unless prevented by absolute poverty (*Su.* 19). The religion founded by Mohammed (2), as Mosheim remarks (3) would have been somewhat different, had he met with no resistance in its propagation. The obstinacy of the Arabs in clinging to many of their ancient traditions, and the hope of attracting both Christians and Jews to his ranks, caused the impostor to tolerate much that was otherwise distasteful to him (4).

It is not our province to enter upon a refutation of Mohammed's doctrines, but we may be allowed to draw the reader's attention to the following points: True religion is ordained for the contemplation of truth, and tends to the cultivation of purity of heart and to the leading of a good

(1) To the credit of Mohammed it must be admitted that though he warred for Islam, he showed no love for the use of torture. In this respect his successors were very different from him.

(2) Christians generally style this religion "Mohammedanism." The term is offensive to Moslem ears, and sounds to them very much as "Nazarenism" would to us. A Mussulman designates his faith as *Islam*, an Arabic word signifying "full submission to the will of God." Its formula, as announced by the *muezzin* from the minarets, is "*Allah illah Allah: Mohammed resoul Allah*"—"God is God: Mohammed is His prophet."

(3) *Hist.*, 8th Cent., p. 1, c. 2, § 2.

(4) Le Noir rightly sums up the Mohammedan system as a tyranny of God over creatures, of man over woman, and of the strong over the weak. See his edition of Bergler's *Dictionary* for an excellent essay on this subject.

life ; while the spirit of Islam is of the earth, earthy, and tends merely to the brutal joys of lust and gluttony. True religion does not contradict itself, but the law of Mohammed is contradictory in nearly every one of its points. True religion is zealous for the majesty and dignity of God, while Islam attributes to Him many absurd, puerile and even wicked things. True religion does not use the art of lying as a means of propagation, while the Koran contains innumerable and shameless untruths (1). True religion does not oppose what it recognises as true and divine ; the Koran acknowledges the Gospel as true and divine, and yet opposes it most strenuously. True religion does not assert that God is the author of sin ; while Mohammed, by declaring that God created Satan out of a pestiferous fire (*Su.* 25), makes the demon evil by nature. From the very origin of Islam, there have not been wanting Christian authors to defend the truth against its attacks, but as the system was one which relied more upon the sword than upon argument for success, our writers generally confined themselves to the encouragement of the Christian peoples in resisting its inroads. However, there are many who combated it from a religious point of view. Thus, Pope Pius II. (1458-64) wrote a learned and elegant epistle to the Turkish sultan, Mohammed II. Cardinal Cusa dedicated to the same Pontiff three books entitled *The Koran Sifted*. The Greek Emperor, John Cantacuzene (d. 1400), wrote four *Apologies for Christianity* against the Mohammedans. The Dominican, Richard of Florence, gave an excellent *Confutation of the Law of Mohammed*. Cardinal Torquemada also wrote much on this matter. Among more modern writers, may be mentioned Guadagnolo, of the Minor Clerks ; Malvasia, of the Minors Conventual ; the Jesuits, Gonzalez and Luchesini ; and finally, the most satisfactory of all, Marracci, of the Congregation of the Mother of God. The reader may also consult with profit, Bergier, in his *Dictionary* : as also Cantù, *passim*, in his *Universal History*, and especially, in the *Documents*, art. *Mohammed*.

(1) In *Sura* 13, the Christians are said to adore Mary as a God. In *Su.* 15, Abraham is said to have been an idolater, and converted by studying the stars. In *Su.* 27, Mohammed calls upon God to witness that he was taken from Mecca to Jerusalem, and thence to Heaven, to receive a revelation. In *Su.* 47, he asserts that Christians attribute daughters, as well as a Son, to God.

The most casual reader of the Koran cannot fail to remark the gross ignorance displayed by its author. Geography, history, chronology, physics, and common sense, are equally ignored in his mixture of Talmud, Arabic romance, and Christian orthodoxy and heresy. Mohammed was not unconscious of his defects in matter of science, and he well knew that knowledge would be an enemy of his doctrine. Hence, he forbade his followers the study of letters and of philosophy, and for more than a century, this prohibition was strictly enforced (1); it was in accordance with this idea, that the caliphs burned the extensive library of Alexandria and all others they could reach. This hatred of science, on the part of the Arabian impostor, would seem, of itself, sufficient to preclude any possibility of sympathy from modern incredulists. Yet, so anxious are these gentry to apologize for everything not Christian, that they retort upon us by saying that Christ never made any profane studies, that His Apostles were ignorant, that the great St. Paul was an enemy of philosophy. They forget that Jesus had no need of study; that His Apostles were enlightened by the Holy Ghost, and that they successfully preached their doctrine before the most learned men of their day; that, as yet, infidelity has found no errors in their writings; that St. Paul was not hostile to true learning, but to that false philosophy which destroys the soul of man. It is sickening to be obliged to draw a comparison between Christianity and Islam, but the interests of truth compel us to the task. The opponents of Christianity are fond of asserting that the proofs for the divine origin of both religions are of the same kind; that a Christian cannot point to the wonderful propagation of his faith as indicative of its having come from God, since the spread of Islam was far more rapid, and nearly as extensive. In chap. 4. we have treated of the propagation of Christianity as a proof of its divinity; it is easy to show that rapid success, while it certainly can be predicated of Islam, cannot be adduced in favor of its claims to obedience.

(1) BRUCKER; *History of Philosophy*, v. 3.

We had occasion to remark, in chapter 4th, that in the age of Augustus it was as improbable, humanly speaking, that Christianity should escape destruction, as it was natural, among the Orientals, and at any time, that the law of Mohammed should be adopted by many. The Mohammedan system was conformable to the brutal instincts of depraved nature; therefore, humanly speaking, it ought to have prospered. Christianity, on the contrary, was diametrically opposed to the tendencies and genius of the age that witnessed its birth, and was a pronounced enemy of all that the carnal man held most dear; therefore, humanly speaking, it should have succumbed. To explain the propagation of Christianity, we must recur to the Providence of God; to explain that of Mohammedanism, the forces of nature are at hand, and furnish evident reasons by which to account for it. Christianity, therefore, rightly claims a divine origin, and hence, our obedience; Mohammedanism, however, plainly shows a human origin, and hence cannot demand our allegiance. And how different was the force against which Mohammed contended from that which was hurled against Christianity! In the days of the Arabian impostor, the Roman Empire was already tottering; in those of his successors, its military strength was contemptible. But in the early days of Christianity, Rome was at the zenith of her power, and it was all put forth against the rival of the state religion.

Few men have surpassed Mohammed in matter of luxury; still fewer have so impudently excused their turpitude. Not content with a plurality of wives, he arrogated to himself the right to take those of others; not content with the intercourse of his more mature slaves, he abused those of tender age. And he dared to justify these excesses as being expressly permitted him by God, composing, with that intent, the 33d and 36th chapters of the Koran. Although he prohibited promiscuous fornication to others, he wrote the 66th chapter to show that God allowed it to him. He was greedy, for he claimed for himself the fifth of all booty, and received bribes for judicial decisions; he even declared that God had given him the entire earth as his own. The very followers of Mohammed did not deny that

he was a hypocrite, perfidious, vindictive, and ambitious; they excused him for all, believing that in everything he was inspired by God (1). And this man is called the peer of Jesus Christ by certain of our infidels. Both were enthusiasts, it is said, both great religionists, both successful reformers, and the system founded by each is human.

The apologists of Mohammedanism admit that the false prophet gave no signs of a divine mission, that he not only performed no miracles, but that he declared he had not come for that purpose. To the people of Mecca, who demanded his divine credentials in the shape of a miracle, he replied that Moses and Jesus had worked them, and yet had converted but few; that miracles do not, of themselves, convince the mind. The followers of Mohammed, indeed, long after his death, attributed many miracles to him, but they are all unworthy of God, and are all unattested by eye-witnesses. Nor do enlightened Mussulmans lay any stress upon these alleged prodigies of the prophet; they cite only the rapid success of their religion as a proof of its divine origin. The miracles of Christ and His Apostles, on the contrary, are adduced by us as evidence of His divine mission; they are attested by eye-witnesses, and are admitted by Pagans as well as Christians; and finally, they are all worthy of God. But there is wanting in Islamism another sign of divine origin, which is possessed by Christianity, in an eminent degree, viz., a sound system of moral teaching. Although prescribing a multitude of external observances, such as purification before prayer, the pilgrimage to Mecca, circumcision, praying five times a day, alms-giving, the fast of the *Ramadan* (2); there is not a word of love of God and of our neighbor, of humility, of gratitude to God, etc. (3). Idolatry alone can exclude the Moslem from eternal happiness. Chastity is of no account, revenge is a duty, perjury is permissible. No law is more sacred to the

(1) MARRACCI, *Preface to Koran*, notes to Su. 66.

(2) During this fast, which lasts twenty-nine days, no one can taste food or drink during daylight. The fast is followed by three days of gluttony called the "Little Bairam."

(3) The angel Gabriel, disguised as a Bedouin, asked Mohammed, "Of what does Islam consist?" The prophet replied, "In professing one God, and me as his prophet; in observing the hours of prayer and the fast of the Ramadan; in alms-giving, and in the accomplishment of the pilgrimage to Mecca." And Gabriel answered, "Such it is."

Islamites than the following: "Fight the infidels until every false religion is annihilated; put them to death, sparing none" (1). Against the "infidel dogs" all injustices are not only permitted, but commanded, and wherever the law of Islam is untempered by fear of the "Frank," it is only by force of gold that the unbeliever can live in the land. And this is the moral code compared, to its advantage, with that of Christ, by certain modern writers. These authors carefully abstain from noting the baneful effects of Islamism. So thoroughly perverted is the imagination of a Mussulman, that he cannot realize the possibility of the least liberty of intercourse between the sexes, without crime as a consequence; hence, the captivity of women under the jailership of eunuchs. Some of our philosophasters make the climate responsible for this corruption. But has the climate changed since the time when Asia and Africa were Christian? In those days, the husband was not so diffident of the virtue of his wife as to keep her under lock and key. And how about Abyssinia, and other Christian communities which are afflicted with the same terribly demoralizing climate? They accord the weaker sex the same liberty that we practise, and with no evil results (2).

Perhaps the principal evil of Islamism, at least, the one which is most felt by Christians living in its midst, and by surrounding nations, is the doctrine of absolute predestination. Believing in remorseless fate, the Islamite does not take the same precautions that the Christian takes to ward off pestilence, famine, &c. The filth of Eastern cities, of most Eastern people in their persons, is too well known to need description. But no fear of plague can cause the Mussulman to forget that "What will be, will be; God is great" (3).

(1) *Koran*, Su. 8, v. 12 and 39; 9, v. 30; 47, v. 4.

(2) In Nubia, females are often nearly naked; sometimes, entirely so. Yet they are eminently modest and retiring.

(3) As we write these pages (1883), the European powers are said to be considering the propriety, or rather the necessity, of some regulation which will obviate the evils attendant upon the pilgrimages to Mecca, always a source of danger to the health of the world, on account of the filthy habits, enjoined by their law on these occasions, upon the devotees.

## CHAPTER XXXVIII.

### THE PAULICIAN HERESY AND THE VENERATION OF THE CROSS.

About the middle of the seventh century, the Manicheans, who, since the days of Justin, had been severely repressed by the civil power, came to be known as Paulicians. The name was derived from one Paul, who, with his brother John, endeavored to revive the dying error of Manes at Samosata in Armenia. The successor of Paul, one Sylvanus, tried to reconcile his system with the language of Scripture, and always plentifully availed himself of the sacred books when teaching. Many, therefore, were led to believe that the resurrected Manicheism was pure and undiluted Christian doctrine. Schism soon broke the ranks of the Paulicians, and about 810 a bloody war occurred between the two factions of Sergius and Baanes; one Theodatus, however, succeeded in pacifying and uniting them. One of the distinguishing features of these sectarians was their opposition to all veneration of saints and their images, but especially to any veneration of the cross; a feature which won for them the friendship of the Mohammedan hordes, then being hurled over the imperial frontiers—in fact, the Iconoclast heresy of the eighth century was but a logical outcome of the sympathy between the Manicheans and the Islamites. The Paulicians and their descendants never wavered in their belief in the two Principles of Manes. They denied the divine maternity of Mary, but deluded the ignorant and simple by professing their belief in “the most holy Mother of God, into whom entered, and from whom came the Lord;” signifying, in their own minds, the heavenly Jerusalem, into which Christ opened an entrance for man. They denied Transubstantiation. They carried their aversion to any veneration of saints to an extravagant extreme, in the case of St. Peter the Apostle, asserting that his denial of Christ had damned him to hell. They held that it was

right, in time of persecution, to dissimulate one's religion. The morals of the Paulicians, like those of all the Manicheans, were of a description that forbids mention (1).

We take the opportunity furnished by this notice of Paulicianism, to show the antiquity of the Catholic custom of venerating the Cross. Protestant authors insist that there is no vestige of our practice to be found in the records of the first three centuries (2). In the fourth and succeeding centuries the evidence of this veneration is so plain, that no Protestant writer of importance has ventured to impugn it. Were no other proof on hand than the reproach of Julian to the Christians of his day, it alone would suffice to show that, in the fourth century, the Cross was venerated more, perhaps, than it is in the nineteenth. "You adore," said the imperial apostate, "the wood of the Cross, you make a sign of it on the forehead, you cut it on the doors of your houses," and St. Cyril of Alexandria replies: 'The Cross reminds us of Christ; we honor it because it reminds us that we should live for Him who died for us all' (3). But let us see whether the first three centuries furnish no proof that the early Christians venerated the Cross. Minutius Felix, towards the end of the second century, composed a Dialogue entitled *Octavius*, in which a Christian, Octavius, and a Pagan, Cæcilius, dispute on religious matters. In the course of the debate, Cæcilius says (chap. 9): "They who insist that the Christian worship consists in the adoration of a man punished for his crimes with death, and in the adoration of the fatal wood of the Cross, attribute to these wicked men altars worthy of them." And in chap. 12, he thus menaces the Christians: "There remain for you now, threats, tortures, crosses or gibbets, not for you to adore, but for you to be fastened upon them." And in chap. 29, Octavius replies: "You are far from the truth when you assert that we worship a criminal and his cross, when you think that we would regard as God a malefactor, or any mortal man. . . . . We neither desire nor honor gibbets, but you do make gods out of wood, and do adore,

(1) See CEDRENS; *Compendium of Histories*. EUTHYMIUS; *Panophy*, tit. 20.

(2) DAILLÉ; *Worship of the Latins*, Geneva, 1671, b. 5. (3) *Against Julian*, b. 6.

perhaps, crosses as portions of your gods." In this testimony of Minutius Felix, we observe that it was the opinion of the Pagan world of his time that the Christians venerated the Cross. Nor does the Christian apologist repel the charge; he simply denies that his co-religionists worship wood, as his adversary is wont to do. St. Justin, also of the second century, in his *Apology*, I., no. 55, says that the Cross is the most striking sign of the power of Christ, of His empire over the world; he recalls the words of Isaias, saying of the Messiah: "And the government is upon his shoulder," saying that here the Cross is signified. Tertullian writes, about the year 203: "In all our actions, when we enter or go out, when we put on our clothes, when we bathe, when we approach the table, when we go to bed, etc. . . . we sign the Cross upon our foreheads. This practice is not commanded by an express law of Scripture; but tradition teaches it, custom confirms it, and faith observes it" (1). Origen, writing about the year 226, says the same (2), and in another place he asks: "What do the demons fear? At what do they tremble? Without doubt at the Cross of Christ, on which they were defeated, on which their rule and power were overthrown. Fear and trembling come over them, when they behold the sign of the Cross confidently impressed upon us" (3).

Claude of Turin, generally regarded by Protestants as one of their forerunners, used to object against our practice as follows: If every piece of wood, fashioned into a Cross, is to be venerated, because Christ hung upon a cross, then many other things must be venerated, which Catholics pass unnoticed. The Saviour was but six hours on the cross, while he was nine months in the womb of Mary; therefore, all young virgins should be venerated. So with cribs, for Christ lay in one; so with boats, for Christ slept on one; so with asses, for Christ rode on one; so with rocks, for Christ's body was laid in one; so with reeds, for Christ was beaten with them, etc. This argumentation is just about as logical as any adduced by the more modern of our adversaries. In this matter, just as in reference to his other errors the Tur-

(1) *Crown*, c. 4.(2) *On Ezekiel*, c. 9.(3) *Exodus*, Hom. VI.

inese heretic was refuted by his contemporary, Jonas of Orleans (1). The reader will find every phase of this question admirably treated by Alexandre (2).

---

## CHAPTER XXXIX.

### THE ICONOCLAST HERESY, AND THE SEVENTH GENERAL COUNCIL.

From very early days war was often made upon the devotion of Catholics to holy images. Not only the Jews, but the Marcionites, Manicheans, and Theopaschites, misrepresented the Catholic doctrine on this subject, and endeavored to procure the banishment of all images from Christian temples. But the Iconoclasts (3) of the eighth century were the first to cause serious trouble in the Church because of image-veneration. The war was originated by the Jews of Arabia in the year 723. A certain influential Hebrew named Sarantapechys, addicted to magic, assured the caliph Jezid that he would have a long and happy reign, provided he would banish the images of Christ and His saints from his dominions. A decree to that effect was accordingly issued, and as the Christians refused to obey, it was forcibly executed by Jews and Mohammedans (4). Having succeeded so well in Arabia, the Jews now turned their attention to Constantinople (5), where Leo the Isaurian occupied the throne. This emperor was already, in a manner, bound to the Jews, for while he was yet an obscure soldier, two of their number had prophesied that he would mount the throne, and he had sworn to be counselled by them, if his ambition was gratified (6). When the people were informed of the edict of Leo, order-

(1) *Veneration of Images*, in *Preface to Book II.*

(2) Cent. VII. diss. 7.

(3) This word, meaning "image-breakers," is derived from the Greek words *eikon* (image) and *klazein* (to break).

(4) See the *Relation* of the monk John, vicar of the eastern bishops, read in the 7th Council.

(5) They were greatly aided by Constantine, bishop of Nacolia in Phrygia, whose impiety, during the persecution of Jezid, had led his diocesans to expel him, and who, coming to the capital, attained the favor of Leo.

(6) This we learn from the Greek historians, Cedrenus, Zonara and Constantine Manasses.

ing the removal of images from the churches, so fierce a tumult was excited among them, that the emperor thought it prudent to dissimulate. He accordingly declared: "I do not design that the images be altogether removed, but I order them to be placed in a more elevated situation, that they may not be kissed, and thus be treated with disrespect, while they are worthy of honor." St. Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople, used all his influence against the imperial innovations, but in vain (1). So great became the fury of the emperor against his Catholic opponents, that, in the year 726, he ordered the burning of the great library of the Imperial College, that he might destroy in its flames twelve of the professors, together with the rector, who would not join the Iconoclasts. By this horrible act were lost to the world 303,000 valuable volumes (2). There had been, for many years, over the Brazen Gate of the city, a statue of our Lord, and Leo ordered it to be removed. The people resisted with arms, and many of the imperial officers were killed; the women threw the agent of Iconoclasm from the ladder, after which they were themselves put to the sword. Executions and confiscations soon became the order of the day.

At this time the Pontifical chair was occupied by Gregory II., and the Isaurian deemed it prudent to request him to convoke a General Council to consider the image question. Among other things in reply, the Pontiff said: "You have asked that a General Council be called; such a thing seems to us to be useless. You are a persecutor of images, a contumelious enemy, and a destroyer; cease, and give us your silence; then the world will enjoy peace, and scandals be no more. . . . . Do you not know that this, your attempt against images, is a turbulent, insolent, and arrogant wickedness? While the churches of God are in peace, you fight, and raise hatred and scandal. Stop this, and be quiet; then will there be no need of a Synod." Leo went so far as to conspire against Pope Gregory. He sent emissaries to Rome with orders to destroy the statues of St. Peter, and to carry the Pontiff into exile, but the fidelity and affection of the

(1) *Acts of St. Stephen the Younger*, in works of St. John Damascene.

(2) See the Greek writers just quoted.

Romans frustrated his plans. With reference to this attempt, Gregory wrote: "If you insult us, and conspire against us, there is no need for us to descend to a contest with you. The Roman Pontiff will go out into the Campagna twenty-four *stadia* (1), and you may then come, and strike the winds." Gregory, however, tried to pacify the furious monarch, but he sent his legates into exile, where, as Pope Nicholas I. attests (2), they died. In the year 730, Leo determined to rid himself of the intrepid patriarch Germanus. Deposed from his throne, he was exiled and finally strangled, when nearly a hundred years of age (3). When Pope Gregory was informed of these events, he held a Synod at Rome, condemned the Iconoclasts, and excommunicated the Emperor Leo and the intruding patriarch Anastasius (4). In the year 731, Gregory II. was succeeded by a third Gregory in the See of Peter, and one of his first acts was to send a legate to Constantinople. So furious was the conduct of Leo at his reception, that the unfortunate man dared not deliver the Pontifical letters, and returning to Rome after his fruitless voyage, he owed his escape from degradation by the indignant Gregory to the prayers of the Italian bishops (5). A Synod of ninety-three bishops was held in 732 by Gregory III., in which was promulgated a Synodical Constitution, decreeing: "If any one hereafter, contemning ancient custom and the faithful practice of the Apostolic Church, shall prove himself a deposer and destroyer of, and a profaner and a blasphemer against, holy images, let him be foreign to the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the unity and society of the whole Church" (6). This decree was sent to Leo by the "Defender" Constantine, but the papers were torn up, and the legate imprisoned for a year. Notwithstanding this treatment, another legation was dispatched the following year, and this time the Roman Senate took care to remind

(1) The *stadium* was a distance of 625 feet. (2) *Epistle to the Emperor Michael.*

(3) This holy prelate was said by his contemporaries to possess the gift of prophecy. Once, while entering the imperial presence, his stole was trod upon by the emperor's chancellor, Anastasius, and his own intruding successor. "Do not hurry," said Germanus, "the circus will wait for you." Fifteen years afterwards, Copronymus had the unworthy man flogged in the circus for treason.

(4) ADRIAN I. ; *Epistle I. to Charlemagne.*

(5) He also promised to prove more courageous on a second trial, but when Leo heard he was on his way, he had him stopped in Sicily.

(6) ANASTASIUS the Librarian; *Life of Gregory III.*

the Byzantine monarch of the necessity of being at peace with Rome, if he hoped to recover the Italian territories which the empire had lost. This embassy also met with insults, and the legates were detained for eight months. From this time until his death in 741, the fury of Leo towards the orthodox knew no bounds, and many martyrs succumbed to it.

With the advent of Constantine Copronymus (1) to the throne, the new heresy gained strength, for this prince forbade his subjects to call Mary the Mother of God, or to give to any martyr or confessor the title of saint. Hence it was that when Artabasdu, his brother-in-law, rebelled against Copronymus, the people gladly acclaimed him emperor (2). During the two years of his reign, Artabasdu restored the images, but in 744, Copronymus regained the throne, and Iconoclasm again triumphed. The Papal throne was at this time filled by St. Zacchary, and he, in turn, endeavored to repress the rising heresy. When his legates arrived at Constantinople, the emperor was anxious about an ensuing campaign against the Saracens, and hence he received the embassy with respect, and dismissed it in hope. But when the war had successfully closed, he became more ardent in his hatred of images. He assembled, in 754, a pseudo-synod of 338 bishops, but took care not to invite or consult any of the patriarchs. On the last day of the conventicle, all the prelates went to the Blachernal church of the Virgin, where Copronymus himself ascended the pulpit, and proclaimed as universal patriarch of Constantinople, a certain Constantine, an heretical monk who had been bishop of Silæum in Pamphylia, but who, on account of crime, had been deprived of his see. The emperor and the new patriarch then proceeded to the Forum, and publicly proclaimed the heresy established in the pseudo-synod, and anathematized all the worshipers and defenders of images, especially Germanus of Constantinople, George of

(1) So called because at his baptism, which was performed by immersion, he had defiled the sacred font.

(2) Anastasius, the pseudo-patriarch, greatly inflamed the minds of men against Copronymus, after Artabasdu had succeeded, however, by swearing by the Holy Cross that he had said: "Do not think that Christ, whom Mary bore, was anything more than man; for Mary bore him, just as my mother bore me." This is learned from Cedrenus.

Cyprus, and John Damascene. The Definition of this Pseudo-Synod bears the title: "Definition of the Great, Holy and Universal Seventh Synod," and the legitimate Seventh General Council thus spurns the claim: "How can it be great and universal, when the bishops of the other churches have neither received it, nor agreed with it, but have anathematized it? It did not have the aid of the Roman Pope of the time, nor of the priests who are around him, either by his vicars, or by an Encyclical Epistle, as the Conciliary law requires. Neither was there the consent of the patriarchs of the East, that is, of Alexandria, Antioch, and the Holy City, nor of the co-ministers and high-priests who are with them. And how can it be the Seventh, when it does not agree with the preceding six holy and venerable Synods?" After the dissolution of his false Synod, Copronymus and his patriarch ordered the Blessed Eucharist to be brought forth, and then commanded the people to swear upon it that they would no more venerate images, but would execrate them as idols. The worthy emperor then perorated against the monastic system, for it happened that the monks were almost alone, among the clergy of the capital, in their repugnance to the imperial theology. He ordered that these "idolaters," whose cowl was a "vestment of darkness," should be stoned wherever met (1). Consistent in his monacophobia, he compelled his protege, the new patriarch, who had been a monk, to ascend the pulpit and declare that he threw off the cowl, that now he would wear a nuptial crown, that he would eat meat, that he would listen to sweet music at the imperial table, &c. But the poor man did not long enjoy all these, for having betrayed some of the blasphemies which Copronymus had privately uttered against Christ and His Mother, he was first exposed and flogged in the circus, and then decapitated (2). A Slavonic eunuch named Nicetas was then made patriarch. The rest of the reign of Copronymus was a continual horror. Few of the Pagan emperors equalled him in persecution of the faithful, and many of his prefects were worthy of their master. The prefect of Thrace, having collected all the monks

(1) *Acts of St. Stephen the Younger.*(2) *Theophanes and Cedrenus.*

and nuns in his jurisdiction, ordered them to be brought before him at Ephesus, and said: "Whoever of you desire to obey the emperor and me, let them put on these garments, and this very hour take spouses. All who refuse, shall have their eyes plucked out, and be transported to Cyprus." Many refused, and were martyred. This prefect was not satisfied with confiscating all the furniture of the monasteries and their churches, or with throwing the images and relics of the saints to the flames. All the works of the fathers, upon which he could lay hands, were also burned (1).

In the year 767, Copronymus tried to win over King Pepin of the Franks to his heresy. Wishing also to obtain the restitution of the Exarchate of Ravenna, he offered his son Leo to a daughter of Pepin in marriage, and expressed his willingness to take the Exarchate in lieu of dowry. Lest the difference of religion should prove a bar to the match, he sent into France several of his accommodating bishops, that an examination might be had on the image question, and one also on the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, about which the Greeks were complaining of the Occidentals. With the permission of the Holy See, as we know from an Epistle of Paul I. to Pepin, a Synod was held at Gentilly, near Paris. Eginhard, Ado of Vienne, Reginus, Aimoin, and the *Annals of the Franks* (Bertinian), speak of this meeting, but say nothing of its result. However, from the action of the French prelates in other Synods, we may suppose that the Iconoclast heresy was condemned, and the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son affirmed.

About this time, Cosmas of Alexandria, Theodore of Antioch, and Theodore of Jerusalem, held a Synod, composed of bishops of their patriarchates, from which a Synodical Epistle, condemning Iconoclasm, was sent to the Holy See. The document was delivered to the Anti-Pope, Constantine, whom Desiderius the Lombard had thrust into the Papal Chair. In 769, Pope Stephen III. held a Synod at Rome, in which, having nullified the acts of the Anti-Pope

(1) *Ibid.*

Constantine, the fathers condemned the Pseudo-Synod of Constantinople and its doctrine on images (1). In 775, Constantine Copronymus appeared before his Judge, and was succeeded by his son Leo. This monarch abstained from persecution for a while, but having discovered two sacred images in the possession of the Empress Irene, he renounced her society, and commenced a course similar to that of his father. But he died in 780, leaving the throne to his son Constantine, a boy of ten years, under the regency of Irene. One of Irene's first acts was the granting of permission to venerate images. In the year 784, the new patriarch, Tharasius, sent his Profession of Faith to Pope Adrian I., and begged him to call an Œcumenical Council. The Byzantine sovereigns also made this request, and urged the Pontiff to come himself, if possible, to preside. In 785, Pope Adrian sent a letter to the empress-regent, in which he urged her, if the images could not be everywhere immediately restored, to cause the rejection, at any rate, of the *Acts* of the Pseudo-Seventh Council. He also sent to Constantinople as his legates for the coming Council, Peter, archpriest of St. Peter's, and Peter, abbot of St. Saba's, but owing to the opposition of many of the imperial soldiery, the Council did not meet until the year 787 (2).

The Seventh General Council was held at Nice in Bithynia, and hence is sometimes called the Second Council of Nice. The first session was held on Sept. 24, and after seven sessions at Nice, the eighth and last was celebrated at the capital, for the convenience of the sovereigns, who wished to be present. There were in attendance 350 or 377 bishops. In the First *Action*, after the usual preliminaries, the fathers considered the cases of the bishops who had fallen into

(1) ANASTASIUS; *Life of Stephen III.*

(2) Theophanes and Cedrenus furnish us with an interesting account of an event which induced the Empress Irene to put an end, as far as she could, to Iconoclasm. In 784, Paul, then patriarch of Constantinople, being seriously ill, abdicated, and retired to a monastery. Irene was much grieved, and visiting him, asked the reason of his resignation. Weeping bitterly, Paul replied: "Would that I never sat on the episcopal throne of Constantinople, since this church of God is tyrannically governed, and being separated from the other sees, is devoted to misery and execration!" Much impressed, Irene sent to him several of the chief senators, to whom he said: "Unless you collect a General Council, and correct your errors, there is no salvation for you." They then asked him: "Why then, when you were made patriarch, did you promise, at your ordination, to never worship images?" Paul answered: "That is the cause of my tears: that has impelled me to repentance, begging God that He will not punish me as a Pontiff hitherto mute, and (solely through fear of you) not openly announcing the truth." Having said this, he expired.

heresy, especially of Basil of Ancyra, Theodore of Myra, and Theodore of Amorium, who made a solemn abjuration. In that of Basil, we read the following anathematisms: "To the calumniators of Christians, that is, to the image-breakers, anathema. To those who turn against the venerable images the Scriptural denunciations of idols, anathema. To those who do not salute the holy and venerable images, anathema. To those who compare the holy images with those of the gods, anathema. To those who assert that Christians treat the images as gods, anathema. To those who knowingly communicate with those who dishonor the venerable images, anathema. To those who say that any one else than Christ our Lord delivered us from idols, anathema. To those who spurn the teachings of the holy Fathers, and the Tradition of the Catholic Church, adopting the sayings of Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus, that unless we are taught by the Old Testament, we do not follow the doctrine of the Fathers nor the holy Synods, nor the Tradition of the Catholic Church, anathema (1). To those who say that the making of images is a diabolic invention, and not the Tradition of the holy fathers, anathema. To those who dare to assert that the Catholic Church has ever received idols, anathema." After the reading of these anathematisms, Basil and the two Theodores were received into the Council. Several other bishops, who had remained in heresy a long time, were remanded to another session.

In the Second *Action*, after the reading of the letters of Pope Adrian to the sovereigns and to Tharasius of Constantinople, the Papal legates said: "Let the most holy Tharasius, patriarch of the imperial city, tell us whether he consents or not to the Letters of the most holy Adrian, Pope of the elder Rome." Tharasius replied: "When the Apostle wrote to the Romans, approving of their zeal for the faith, he said: 'Your faith is spoken of in the whole world.' One must accept this testimony, and he who tries to resist it, acts unadvisedly. Hence, bishop Adrian of the elder Rome being one of those who merited to be strengthened by the

(1) This anathema was inserted because the Iconoclasts were fond of appealing to Scripture alone.

aforesaid testimony, wrote expressly and truly to our pious sovereigns, and to our Humility, well asserting that he possessed the ancient Tradition of the Catholic Church. And we ourselves, searching the Scriptures, have syllogistically investigated; and what we have already avowed, we do avow and will avow, we consent to and confirm, and we will persevere in the meaning of the Letters which have been read, receiving images, according to the ancient Tradition of our fathers. And these we worship with an affectionate love, as being made in honor of Christ God, and of the inviolate Lady, the holy Mother of God, and of the Holy Angels, and of all the Saints, most clearly placing our faith and service in one only God." The Papal legates then asked the Council whether it received the letters of Adrian, and the fathers answered: "We follow, we receive, we admit." Then each bishop declared that he received the doctrine of respect to images, "according to the Synodical Letters of the most Blessed Adrian, Pope of the elder Rome" (1).

In the Third *Action* were read the invitations to the Council sent by Tharasius to the eastern patriarchs, and their excuses for not attending. These prelates give the following testimony to their belief in the authority of the Holy See: "It is to be carefully born in mind that no one of our bishops was present at the Sixth Holy Synod, because of the tyranny of the barbarians; but no prejudice accrued to the Synod on account of this fact, nor was it prevented from establishing and manifesting the right dogmas of truth; especially since the most Holy and Apostolic Roman Pope agreed with it, and was present through his legates. And now, most holy fathers, with the help of God, the same will happen. For if the faith of that Synod then resounded to the ends of the earth, so will be preached in every place under the sun that of the Synod now assembled, by the grace of God, and your intervention, and that of him who rules the See of the Prince of the Apostles.

(1) After the dissolution of the Synod, the patriarch Tharasius thus wrote to Pope Adrian, concerning the Pontifical Letters: "When we had all sat down, we made Christ our Head. For in the Holy See there was the Holy Gospel, teaching all the holy men who had met, 'Judge just judgments;' judge between the Holy Church and the novelties which have been introduced." And when the letters of your Fraternal Holiness were first read, all were awaiting them as spiritual food in the royal supper which Christ was preparing, through your Letters, for the banqueters."

In the Fourth *Action* were read many passages from the ancient fathers, approving the use of images. Then were read the Epistle of Pope Gregory III. to Germanus of Constantinople, and several letters of Germanus. New anathemas were pronounced on the Iconoclasts, and a Profession of Faith was signed by all the bishops. The Papal legates subscribed first, then Tharasius, then the vicars of the other patriarchs, finally the bishops.

In the Fifth *Action*, it was shown that the Iconoclast errors were derived from the Jews, Saracens, and Manicheans. The Papal legates issued the following decree: "To the most Holy Tharasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, the new Rome: We, Peter, Archpriest of the most holy Church of the Holy and praiseworthy Apostle Peter, and Peter, Priest and Abbot of the Monastery of St. Saba; both holding the place of Adrian, Pope of the elder Rome; do deem it proper, according to the opinion of all of us, yea, according to the ancient tradition of the Catholic Church, as all the holy fathers teach us, that there be brought among us an image to be revered, and that we do salute it. . . . . And we suggest another Chapter: that all signatures, which have been given against venerable images, be anathematized or given to the flames." The Holy Synod answered: "Let it be brought; let it be so done."

In the Sixth *Action*, the Iconoclast Definition of the Pseudo-Seventh Synod was read, and condemned, chapter by chapter. On their arrival at a passage where it was asserted that only one image should be venerated, namely, that in which the Saviour placed Himself under the appearances of bread and wine, the fathers declared that this form of expression was foreign to the doctrine of the Catholic Church. For, although the fathers have called the bread and wine figures of the Body and Blood of Christ, this saying was meant in regard to them, as they are before the consecration; after the consecration, they are not an image, but really the Body and Blood of the Lord. The faith of the Iconoclasts in the Real Presence was sound, however, as can be shown by the context of the Definition, and by the very reasons they alleged for calling the Eucharist the

only image of Christ (1). The following are the passages which some Protestant authors adduce as showing that the Iconoclasts denied Transubstantiation: "Let those rejoice and exult, and confidently act, who, with sincere souls, make the true image of Christ, and desire and worship it, and offer it for the salvation of body and soul; the one which the most holy Immolator and our God. . . . gave to His ministers as a figure and memorial of His own passion. For when He was about to deliver Himself up to a memorable and life-giving death, He blessed the bread which he had taken, and giving thanks, He broke it, and giving it, said: 'Take and eat ye this, in the remission of sins; this is My Body.' And in like manner, giving the chalice, He said: 'This is My Blood; do this in commemoration of Me.' As though, under heaven, there was no other figure or form He could choose to represent, like an image, His Incarnation." But in these words, the Iconoclasts do not call the Eucharist a *mere* image. They regarded the species of bread and wine as an image of Christ, when visibly and externally considered; but they also believed that the Eucharist was the substance of the Body of Christ, when considered intrinsically and as to its invisible nature; when, that is, it is an object of faith, not of the senses. For, immediately after the quoted words, they say: "As we have said, the Lord Jesus so operated that as He deified the Flesh He assumed, by its very union, with a sanctification as to nature, *so He wished the Eucharistic bread*, by the advent of the holy Spirit to be sanctified as a true image of His natural Flesh, *to be made the Divine Body, by means of the priest*, who separating the oblation from the common (kind), causes it to attain sanctification." As the Seventh Council said (2), the Iconoclasts, "dismissing what was false, touched the truth somewhat, when they said: 'to be made the Divine Body.' If it is only the image of the Body, it cannot be the Divine Body." But not only does the context of the objected passage show the faith of the Iconoclasts in the Real Presence; the same is proved by the very reasons they assign for styling the Eucharist an image.

(1) See Alexandre's *Dissert.* IV., Cent. 8.

(2) *Refutation of the Pseudo 7th Synod*, by Epiphanius the Deacon, read to and approved by the 7th Council. *Action* 6.

Alexandre thus describes their ratiocination : " Every image which represents the Human Nature of Christ, separate from the Deity, favors the heresy of Nestorius, which divides the Natures, and introduces an addition of Person. But every image of Christ represents the Human Nature separate from the Deity, for the uncircumscribed Deity cannot be pictured. Hence it is sacrilegious to make such an image. Besides, they said, an external image, which is a thing subsisting by itself, cannot represent its prototype, unless as also by itself subsisting. But the Human Nature of Christ does not subsist by itself ; it is sustained by the Person of the Word. It therefore cannot be represented, unless by an image of the same condition, that is, which does not subsist in itself, but is sustained by the substance of the Son of God, to which it is personally united. Now the only image of Christ, of this kind, is the Eucharist. No other image therefore must be made or revered. And indeed, in their Definition, the Iconoclast synodals say : " As that which He took from us is the matter alone of a human substance, perfect throughout, not properly figuring a subsisting person, in order that no addition of person may accrue to the Divinity ; so He ordered to be offered, the image, that is, the principal matter, the substance of bread, not figuring the form of man, lest idolatry might be introduced. . . . . And as the Flesh of the Lord, endowed, according to nature, with a mind, is anointed by the Holy Ghost with the Divinity, so the divinely-given image of His Flesh, that is, the Divine Bread, is filled with the Holy Ghost, as also the Chalice, holding the life Blood from His side. This, therefore, is shown to be the true image of the dispensation, which was made in the Flesh of Christ our God, which He, the true Vivifier and Former of nature, gave to us with His own voice." The reasoning of the Iconoclasts was captious in the extreme, for although the image of a living man does not represent his soul, unless by implication, yet it by no means figures a body separated from its soul. Just so an image of Christ, though it does not, and cannot, figure the uncircumscribed Deity to our senses, yet it does not represent the human nature of our Lord separated from the Divine. That the Iconoclasts held the doctrine of the

Real Presence, is also evident from the absence of any rebuke on this point in the writings of the fathers who took up the pen against them. The faith of the Church at that time, in this matter, was just what it always was, and is to-day. The reader will pardon us, if we are leaving our province, to adduce the following passage of St. John Damascene (1): "How shall this be done unto me, said the Holy Virgin, when I do not know man? The Archangel Gabriel replied: The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. And do you now also ask how the bread and wine, joined with water, become the Body and Blood of Christ? I answer you: The Holy Ghost comes, and effects that which exceeds the faculty of prayer and the understanding of the mind. . . . . Certainly, the Body truly united to the Divinity is that Body which was born of the Holy Virgin; not that the Body descended from heaven, but because the bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of God. If you ask how this is done, let it be enough for you to hear that it *is done* by the Holy Ghost, just as, through the Holy Ghost, the Lord made, from the Holy Mother of God, Flesh for Himself and in Himself. . . . . Nor is anything plainer to us than that the word of God is true, efficacious, and omnipotent; the manner is such that no reason can penetrate it. But it would not be futile to say that as bread, in food, and wine and water, in drink, are changed into the body and blood of the receiver, and are made into another body, so the bread and wine and water of Proposition are changed, by the invocation and coming of the Holy Ghost, into the Body and Blood of Christ; nor are they two, but one and the same . . . . . *Nor are the bread and wine a figure of the Body and Blood of Christ, but the very Body itself of the Lord, joined to his Divinity, for the Lord Himself said: 'This is' not a figure of, but, 'My Body'; not a figure of, but, 'My Blood.'*"

In the Seventh *Action* was issued a Definition of Faith receiving and confirming the previous six Œcumenical Councils. It was then decreed that 'the figure of the life-giv-

(1) *Orthodox Faith*, b. 3, c. 14. The Damascene is ranked by the Greeks with Peter Lombard and St. Thomas of Aquin. He died about 760.

ing cross, and the venerable and holy images, both painted and of stone, or of other proper material, should be set up in the churches, and put on the sacred vessels and vestments, on the walls and tables, in houses and along the streets: that is, the image of our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, and of our inviolate Lady, the Holy Mother of God, and of the honorable angels, and of all the saints." It was declared that the souls of the faithful are excited, by the use of images, "to a remembrance of their prototypes, to a desire (to imitate them), and to give them a respectful devotion; not, however, to a true worship (*latría*), which is due to the Divine Nature alone; so that the homage of incense and lights should be extended to them, just as to the precious and life-giving cross and to the holy gospels, and other sacred objects, as was the pious custom of the ancients. For the honor paid to an image is shown to the original."

The Seventh General Council edited twenty-two Canons for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, which had become somewhat relaxed during the Iconoclast troubles. The 1st Canon confirms the ancient ones, viz., the Apostolic, and those of the six preceding Œcumenical Councils. This Canon was not confirmed by the Holy See, because the Pontiffs always refused to recognize other than a certain number of the so-called Apostolic Canons (1). Again, the See of Rome always rejected the Constantinopolitan Canons, the 28th of Chalcedon, and the Trullan. The 2d Canon decrees that no one can be made a bishop who has not the *Psalter* by memory, and who is not thoroughly versed in the Scriptures. The 3d condemns the choosing of bishops, priests, and deacons by princes. The 4th prohibits bishops from receiving money or any kind of presents from their clergy, "because the children should not gather riches for he parents, but the parents for the children." The 7th Canon ordered that in all churches which had been dedicated, during the Iconoclast troubles, without the usual deposit of sacred relics, a remedy of the defect should at once be supplied; and commanded also that, hereafter, any bishop

(1) The Holy See received the first 50 of these Canons, excepting the 46th and 47th, on the Baptism of Heretics, as was decreed by Stephen III., in Syn. Lat., act. 4, and by Urban II. in Epistle 17, given by Gratian, *Dist.* 32.

who would presume to dedicate a church without the use of relics, should be deposed. The 11th Canon decreed the appointment, in every church and monastery, of a steward or administrator. The 12th Canon deposed any bishop or abbot who would in any way alienate the revenues of ecclesiastical property. The 17th Canon forbade the erection of any church or ecclesiastical edifice, the money for which had not been certainly provided. The other Canons are of minor importance.

In previous chapters we have been obliged to defend the authority of the Roman Pontiffs over General Councils, from the attacks of those who contend that, in several instances, the bishops of the Universal Church, in General Council assembled, have subjected the Dogmatic Epistles of the Popes to a juridical examination. Now, just as in the case of the letters of Cælestine I. to the General Council of Ephesus, and in that of the Letter of Leo the Great to Flavian, read in the Council of Chalcedon, so in the case of the Letters of Adrian I. to the patriarch Tharasius, and to the sovereigns Irene and Constantine, writers of the Gallican school have insisted that the fathers of the Seventh Council submitted them to Synodical scrutiny and judicial criticism, before finally accepting them. As in previous instances, so here we have as opponents the Author of the Defence of the Declaration of the French Clergy in 1682 (1), and the learned Cardinal de

(1) With regard to this *Defence*, generally ascribed to the great Bossuet, the reader will please note the following remarks of the Marquis Maffei (*Literary Observations*, v. 5, p. 4): "Why did he (Bossuet) wait so long, before publishing this book? Why did he not, at least when dying, advise its publication? It would seem, either that he had not yet perfected it, or that he was not so well pleased with it as with his other books. That it has been interpolated by another hand, many suspect, from the fact that it remained hidden for 26 years after his death (and it was written 22 years before he died), being published only in 1730, when an angry faction was trying, by every art, not only to restrict, but to annihilate the Pontifical power. Are we to believe that Bossuet wrote the 12th chapter of this book, where he himself is so praised, and in which his *Exposition of Faith* is so exalted? . . . . . How can we ascribe certain sentiments of this book to the prelate who, in a discourse to the Assembly of the Clergy in 1682, used this language: 'Let it not be said that the ministry of St. Peter ended with himself; that cannot end, which has to sustain an eternal Church. Peter will always speak in his See, as was declared by 600 bishops in the Council of Chalcedon. . . . . The Roman Church, taught by St. Peter, and by his successors, knows no heresy; she is ever a virgin, and the Roman faith is that of the Church.' With these sentiments accords badly the saying that the bishops have the right of judging, in first instance, of questions of faith, and that, when afterwards the matter is brought before the Pope, and he sends his decision straight to the bishops, they can, even without another Council, see whether it is proper, and approve or reject it, as they deem fit. For, if such is the case, if both the first and last sentence belong to the bishops, what remains for the Pope? If his Definition is to be thus treated, his authority is no greater than that of some curate or private doctor, whose opinion might be asked. We cannot understand how such a sentiment could come from an author who, in this very work, teaches that, according to the ancient maxims, serious causes of religion should, from every part of the Catholic world, be taken to Rome, and that every Christian Church owes *obedience* to the Roman Pontiff. In fine, in reference to some passages of this work, we might say what the learned Archbishop of Embrun, M<sup>casig</sup>. Tencin (afterwards Cardinal), said in regard to another: 'The

**la Luzerne.** We have seen that in the 2d *Action* of the Seventh Council, the Papal legates demanded of the patriarch Tharasius whether he accepted the letters of Pope Adrian. From the answer of the patriarch, our opponents gather that he assented to the doctrine taught in those letters, not because of the authority of the writer, but simply because of the respect due to the utterances of a Church which had been so highly praised by St. Paul. The legates then asked of the fathers of the Council, "whether, *or not*, they accepted the Letters" of Adrian. In the phrase, "*or not*," says La Luzerne, lies the proof that the decree of the Pontiff was not regarded as irreformable. In reference to the mind of Tharasius when he answered the legates, his own words to Pope Adrian show that he respected, in the person of the Pontiff, the teaching authority of the Church. "When we had all sat down," he says, "we made Christ our head. For in the Holy See there was the Holy Gospel, teaching all the holy men who had met: 'Judge just judgments;' judge between the holy Church and the novelties which have been introduced. And when the Letters of your Fraternal Holiness were first read, all were awaiting them as spiritual food in the royal supper which Christ was preparing, through your Letters, for the banqueters, and in which, like an eye, you manifested the whole body of rectitude and the way of truth. Thus therefore the separated members were joined together, thus true constancy was confirmed, thus the Catholic Church acquired unity." Tharasius furnishes, in his reply to the legates, no argument for our adversaries, unless they are willing to admit that he thought he was free to differ from a Definition of Faith made by a General Council. For, just as he said he had syllogistically examined into the agreement of the Pontiff's Letter with the Scriptures and the teachings of the Fathers, so, although anathema had been pronounced against the Iconoclasts in the 2d *Action*, nevertheless, in the 4th, Tharasius persuaded the bishops to adduce in favor of their teaching the passages of Scripture

posthumous works of Monsig. Bossuet can never have the authority of those published by himself. The posthumous ones appear to have been written in order to make the author contradict himself; so much so, that if Bossuet is the author, we may believe, either that he did not deem them worthy of the light, or that he did not revise them with that care, which made his pen formidable to heretics."

and sayings of the fathers which militated against the errors already condemned. This he did, not that the condemnation needed any corroboration, but, as he explained, "that by drawing from them (the Scriptures and Tradition), we may each give drink to the flocks committed to our care. Thus our voice will go into every land, and the strength of our words to the ends of the earth." We may also observe with Palma (1), that our adversaries should show that the bishops of the Seventh Council juridically examined the Letters of Adrian before they accepted them: "And even though we grant, which cannot be concluded from the words of Tharasius, that he only assented to the Letters of Adrian because the never-failing faith of Christ is in the succession of the Roman Pontiffs, and not because the definitions of each Pope, in matters of faith and morals, are infallible; yet the testimony of Tharasius would not show that the Council really examined the letters of Adrian."

In further illustration of our position, we would notice the Letters written by Pope Adrian before the Council, which certainly show that he regarded Iconoclasm as already condemned by himself, and that he wished the Council merely to carry his sentence into execution. We shall then look into the action of the bishops on the matter. In his first Epistle to the sovereigns, the Pontiff says of St. Peter: "He then, who was so pre-eminently honored, was worthy to confess the faith upon which is founded the Church of Christ. The blessing of reward followed the blessing of the confession, the preaching of which illuminated the Holy Universal Church . . . . . For the very Prince of the Apostles, Blessed Peter, who first sat in the Apostolic See, left the principality of the Apostolate and of pastoral care to his successors, who are ever to sit in that Most Holy See; and to them he left, by divine command, the power of authority, just as it had been given to him by the Lord God our Saviour. According to the Tradition handed down by them, we ought to venerate the sacred image of Christ, that of His most holy Mother, and those of the Apostles and of all the saints . . . . . I demand, and

(1) *Lectures*, c. 75.

I adjure you, that you order the same sacred images to be restored as of old in your imperial and God-preserved city, and throughout all the Greek dominions; observing the Tradition of this our most holy Roman Church, rejecting and spurning the wiles of the heretical and the impious, that you may be received in the embraces of this our Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and irreprehensible Roman Church." It is evident then that the Pontiff ordered the restoration of all the images before the holding of the Council; he styles as heretics those who refuse to obey; which certainly does not indicate, on his part, a willingness to subject his Letters to a Synodical examination. And he finally commands that the Pseudo-Seventh Council shall be immediately condemned, in the presence of his legates. In his Epistle to the patriarch Tharasius, Pope Adrian explicitly declares that if his commands are not obeyed, the patriarch will be deprived of his throne. Here therefore is another instance, to be joined with those we have, on other occasions, adduced, of a Roman Pontiff prescribing what shall be done in an Œcumenical Council, and of his regarding as irreformable that which he has already decreed in the premises. And how did the Seventh Council receive these Pontifical injunctions? By obeying them, and without any previous inquisition into their authoritativeness or their orthodoxy. In the very first *Action*, it was ordered that the Iconoclast bishops should be received by the Council only as heretics, or as persons abjuring heresy, and they were commanded to proffer certain anathematisms against their former errors and against the Pseudo-Council. This is shown by the *Confession of Faith* of Basil of Ancyra, read in the 1st *Action*: "I reject, and with my whole heart anathematize the Synod called the Seventh, which was convoked in obstinacy and in madness." And shortly after, he declared: "Anathema to the calumniators of Christians, that is, to the image-breakers." And in the *Confession* of Theodore of Ammorium, was pronounced: "Anathema to those who do not revere the venerable images . . . . anathema to all who hesitate, and do not heartily declare that they venerate the holy images." It is evident therefore that the Fathers of the Seventh Council, not only did not think that

the Letters of Pope Adrian were to be juridically examined, but that they regarded it as their first duty to obey his orders, and to receive his doctrine.

At the conclusion of the Seventh General Council, the Holy See received a copy of its *Acts*, and a letter from the sovereigns Irene and Constantine, requesting their confirmation. Pope Adrian ordered the *Acts* to be translated into Latin, and to be deposited in the Pontifical Archives, but postponed the confirmation to a later date. His wish was to send a copy of the Latin version of these *Acts* to the French churches, that they might receive the attention of the many learned men who graced the court of Charlemagne. This laudable design of the Pontiff was the occasion of considerable trouble, and has given rise to a dispute as to the opinions of the French and German bishops of that day, in regard to the veneration of images. It happened that the party to whom had been committed the task of translating the *Acts* of the Seventh Council, so misrepresented the teachings of the members of that Synod, that, upon reading his version, the French bishops were led to believe that they were called upon to give to images an excessive, and even idolatrous, devotion. Hence it was that, about the year 790, there was issued a work, under the name of Charlemagne, which severely attacked the Seventh Council. This work, being composed of four books, and purporting to be by Charlemagne, is known by the name of the *Caroline Books*. In consequence, also, of this false idea of the meaning of the Seventh Council, its decree on image-veneration was condemned by a Synod of French and German bishops, held at Frankfort in 794. Protestant writers have seized upon the *Caroline Books* and the decrees of the Synod of Frankfort, as evidence of the Iconoclast belief of the French and German churches in the eighth century. Some Catholic authors, on the contrary, have ascribed the *Caroline Books* to a heretic of the time of Charlemagne, while others, also Catholic, have thought the author to have been a heretic of the 16th century (1). It can be shown,

(1) Alexandre, in his *Diss.* 6, Cent. 8, proves, against Surius and Bellarmine, that these *Books* were written either by Charlemagne, or by his order. He argues, firstly, from the *Preface*, where the author speaks of "his father, king Pepin." Secondly, from a Synod of

however, that the author of the *Caroline Books* was no Iconoclast; that he rejected the Seventh Council's decree because he falsely, or rather, mistakenly, supposed that the worship of *Latria*, due to God alone, had been authorized, by that Synod, as appropriate to images. The reader must know that Charlemagne and his compatriots were, about that time, so disposed in mind towards the Byzantine court, as to be ready to believe that its fickleness and levity were capable of any extravagance. During the early days of her regency, the Empress Irene had asked of Charlemagne the hand of his daughter Rotrude for her son Constantine; the offer had been accepted, and oaths of fidelity interchanged. But in 788, Irene changed her mind, and compelled Constantine, then in his eighteenth year, to marry an Armenian princess. Such a slight was not easily to be forgotten, nor were its perpetrators likely to be charitably regarded (1). When therefore it was reported that the "Synod of the Greeks" had encouraged idolatry, personal pique led Charlemagne to lend a facile ear to the rumor. In these circumstances were issued the *Caroline Books*. The French bishops were greatly influenced by the Latin version of a saying of Constantine, a Cyprian bishop, which appeared, in the reports of the Seventh Council received by them, couched in these terms: "I receive and honorably embrace the sacred and venerable images, according to the service of adoration which I give to the consubstantial and life-giving Trinity; and I separate from the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and subject to anathema, those who do not thus think" (2). The word "adoration," so susceptible of various meanings, and several weak arguments, used by the Seventh Synod, which, by the way, was not yet regarded as Œcumen-

Paris, under Louis the Debonnaire, speaking of Charlemagne as the author. Thirdly, from Hincmar of Rheims, citing verbally the 38th Chapter of Book 4, and ascribing it to the same emperor. Fourthly, from the Vatican MSS., bearing the name of Charlemagne.

(1) In after years, ambition led Charlemagne to pocket this affront. In 802, he vainly offered Irene his own hand, that he might unite the Eastern and Western Empires. Irene was willing, but her courtiers were not.

(2) In the original Greek *Acts*, the saying of bishop Constantine reads very differently: "I receive and honor the holy images, but I give only to the Supreme Trinity the adoration of worship (*latria*)." Pope Adrian, in his *Apologetic Epistle* to Charlemagne, explains the strong expressions of this prelate, just converted from Iconoclasm, by his natural wish to remove any doubts as to his orthodoxy. For the rest, says the Pontiff, the Council well understood the sense of his emphatic words. See chap. 9 of the *Epistle*.

ical, not having been confirmed by the Roman Pontiff, all joined to the sentence of the Cyprian bishop, and his own political prejudices, induced the Carolinian author to reject the Seventh Council's decree as he understood it. But it is evident that he did not reject the veneration of images, as it is understood and encouraged by the Catholic Church. In Book I., c. 2, we certainly read: "But in images, made by the labor of artists, which often excite admiration in the spectator, on account of the remembrance of deeds done, but always draw the worshiper into error; for it is not a slight error to adore, with the service of religion, other than Him who said: 'The Lord thy God thou shalt adore, and Him alone shalt thou serve.'" But we also read, in *Book II.*, c. 31, while the author is comparing the legitimate with the pretended Seventh Council, "The one despised and removed the images forever from the churches; the other, not only decreed that they should be retained, but commanded that they should be suppliantly adored. The one threw them to the flames; the other honors them with incense. The one refused even to look upon them; the other would not cease to embrace them. The one dug away the ornaments of the ancient walls; the other honors them, newly restored, with offered lights. The one wished them to be abominated; the other allows them to be kissed. The one anathematized their possessors; the other those who do not adore them. Now since these two evils are contrary, and both far from the truth, let us take the royal path, walking, according to the Apostle, neither to the right nor to the left; not removing the images, according to the one, nor adoring them, with the other; but adoring God alone, and venerating His saints, according to the ancient Tradition of the Fathers and of the Church, keeping the images, if we wish, in the churches, as ornaments and memorials of deeds done." Under all this ill-disguised petulance, and aversion for the "Synod of the Greeks," the Carolinian author betrays no un-Catholic doctrine concerning images. The word "adoration" alone offends his ears, just as it offends our Protestant friends. He must have known the difference, however, between the adoration of

*latría* (supreme worship) and that of *dulia* (inferior worship), and we are perforce of opinion that his Græcophobia was, for the moment, too violent to admit of the exercise of theological acumen or of common sense (1). But with all his repugnance to the use of the word "adoration" in connection with images, the question with him is really rather one of degree, than of the thing itself. It is certain that the early Gallic Church sanctioned the veneration of images (2), although it seems to have objected to the more ardent practices of the Orientals, such as genuflections before them, kisses, incensations, and burning of lights. The French clergy were much displeased with the Seventh Council for pronouncing anathema against those who would not give positive respect to images: "If any one does not salute the images in the name of the Lord and of His saints, let him be anathema;" nor did they relish the denunciation as "half-wicked," made by Epiphanius the Deacon in the 6th *Action* of those who thought it sufficient to simply retain, but not honor, the images. Placed therefore between the two *Definitions*, that of the Copronymian Synod, and that of the 7th Council, not yet confirmed, they decided to take the middle path of neither rejecting nor adoring the images (3). We may also observe, finally, that the mind of the French clergy could not have been averse to all image-worship, since twelve of their most learned prelates had assisted at the Roman Synod held by Pope Stephen IV., and had sanctioned the same devotion (4); moreover, in the Synod held under Pepin at Gentilly, in the presence of the legates of the Byzantine emperor, the French prelates had distinctly condemned Iconoclasm.

(1) The tone of this author is prejudiced throughout his book. In fact, he is soaddicted to carping, that his sincerity appears doubtful. He ridicules Irene and Constantine because, in accordance with the inflated style long in vogue at Constantinople, they call their mis-sives "Divine;" and because they say: "God has chosen us, who truly seek His glory." He finds fault with their phrase, "Through God, who reigns with us." He laughs at the Seventh Council, as having a woman, Irene, for a teacher. We say that the Carolingian author must have known the distinction made by the fathers, at least from the 4th century, as the Calvinist Daillé himself admits, between the adoration (supremacy) of *latría* and that (relative) of *dulia*. The French clergy of his time, reinforced by the extensive immigration of the learned monks of Ireland, were more cultured by far than the Byzantine, and even these latter were familiar with the distinction. Originally and in the grammatical sense, the terms *latría* and *dulia* were synonymous, but by their adoption into the theological vocabulary, they acquired different meanings.

(2) St. Gregory of Tours (b. 544), in his *Glory of the Martyrs*, b. 1, c. 23, speaks of a vision in which Christ ordered that his pictures should not present His figure in an uncovered state. Pope St. Gregory the Great rebuked Serenus of Marseilles for removing images from his churches. "It is one thing," said he (*Book 7, ep. 111*) "to worship a picture, another to learn from it what is to be adored . . . . prohibit not the use of images, but only their worship."

(3) *Caroline Books*, b. 2, c. 3.

(4) Anastasius the Librarian, *Life of Stephen IV.*

We now approach an event which Protestant authors, following in the footsteps of the celebrated Calvinist Daillé, have endeavored to present as another excellent argument against the antiquity of our devotion to images. In the year 794, Charlemagne caused to be held at Frankfort-on-Main, a Synod of about three hundred bishops, convened from Italy, France, and Germany, to consider the doctrine of Elipand and Felix, two Spanish prelates, who taught that Christ, according to his Humanity, was only the adoptive Son of God. At this Synod two Papal legates, the bishops Theophylactus and Stephen, were present in the name of Adrian I. After the condemnation of Elipand (of Toledo) and Felix (of Urgel), the Synod took up the question of images, and in its 2d Canon decreed: "There was brought before the fathers a question about the late (*nova*) Synod of the Greeks, held at Constantinople on the adoration of images, in which it was written that those should be anathematized who would not give service or adoration to images, as to the life-giving Trinity. Our holy fathers, refusing, in every way, such service and adoration, despised and condemned those who consented to it." In answer to this objection, Petau (1) replies that the bishops of Frankfort condemned, not the 7th Synod itself, but the strong expressions of Constantine of Cyprus, which they regarded, according to their badly translated copy of the *Acts*, as sanctioning the supreme service of *latria* to images. It is certain, however, that the bishops of Nice embraced the opinions of the Cyprian prelate; therefore, the reply of Petau is not satisfactory. Vasquez, Suarez, Bini, and others, give a no less dissatisfactory answer, one indeed, which is to be absolutely rejected. They contend that the Synod of Frankfort, when editing the above canon, had in mind, not the Seventh Council which restored image worship, but the Copronymian Pseudo-Synod, which abolished it. The 2d Canon of Frankfort, say these writers, condemns the Synod "held at Constantinople;" but the legitimate 7th Council was held at Nice; therefore, the latter was not condemned at Frankfort. But we must remember

(1) *Incarnation*, b. 15, c. 13.

that the 7th Council was convoked for, and met at Constantinople, and would have there held its sessions, had it not been for the mutinous Iconoclast soldiery, fear of whom caused a removal to Nice; and that the last session of the Council was really held in the capital, that the sovereigns might be present. Hence, the bishops of Frankfort might quite naturally speak of the Seventh Council as a "Synod held at Constantinople." Again, the Frankfort prelates condemned "the late" Synod; now, while their term might well be applied to a Council celebrated only seven years before, as was the Seventh Council, it would scarcely be used in regard to one held forty years before, as was the Copronymian conventicle. Finally, the Synod of Frankfort distinctly asserts that it condemns and spurns those who consented to the giving of adoration to images; but of the two Synods in question, the Seventh Council alone answers to this description. It is clear then that another answer than that of Suarez, etc., must be given to Daillé and his imitators, alleging the authority of the Synod of Frankfort against the practice of devotion to images.

We must admit that the Synod of Frankfort rejected the decree of the Seventh Council: but we contend, with Baronio, Bellarmine, and Du Perron, that it was under a false impression with regard to the meaning of that decree; that, in fine, the Frankfort prelates, just like the author of the *Caroline Books*, did not condemn the doctrine of image-worship, as it is understood and taught by the Catholic Church, but merely the doctrine which would accord to images the supreme adoration of *latría*, which doctrine is condemned by the Church herself. This is evident from the words of the 2d Canon. In fact, the *Profession of Faith*, pronounced by Constantine of Cyprus in the Seventh Council, had been so abominably distorted by the incompetent translator, that it is no wonder that the indignation of the Frankfort prelates was excited against the Synod that received it (1). He is made to say: "I receive and honor

(1) Anastasius the Librarian, who, by order of Pope John VIII., made a new version of these Acts, says of the translation which caused such trouble: "At nearly every step the translator ignored the idioms of each language, so that what was really intended, and seldom or never be understood. . . . for this reason, it is despised by nearly all."

ably embrace the holy images, according to the service of adoration, which I give to the consubstantial and life-giving Trinity." Now, in the Greek text, the words "I receive and honorably embrace the holy images" are given in participles, and depend on what goes before, so that the whole sentence should read: "I, although unworthy, consent to these, and am of the same opinion, receiving and honorably embracing the holy images." Then comes the next part of the sentence, asserting the kind of adoration to be given to the Blessed Trinity: "and the adoration which is according to *latria*, I give only to the consubstantial and life-giving Trinity." Had the prelates of Frankfort seen a correct version of this *Profession*, there would have been no ill-feeling against the Seventh Synod, for their doctrine on the image question was not different from that of Rome, as is evident from the fact that communion between the Holy See and the churches of France and Germany was not suspended, even for a day. Nor did the churches of France and Germany cease to communicate with the Greeks. This is certainly a proof that the former did not think that the latter had erred in dogma; that they only regarded the discipline, sanctioned at Nice, as likely to be abused by the ignorant, and hence a dangerous one to tolerate. Indeed, the prelates of Frankfort did not condemn precisely the *Definition of Faith* of the Seventh Synod, which accorded to images an honor far inferior to the adoration of *latria*, due to God alone; they condemned what was said to have been asserted by Constantine of Cyprus in the Synod, namely, that images should receive the same honor as the Blessed Trinity. But is it not strange, one may ask, that the prelates of Frankfort entertained such feelings, as they certainly manifested, towards an Œcumenical Council? We must bear in mind that they did not regard the Seventh Council as universal; they looked upon it as a National Council of the Greeks. That such was the case, is proven by a number of testimonies from contemporary and proximately succeeding authors (1), and by the

(1) The Fulda *Annals of the Franks*, say of it: "The Pseudo-Synod of the Greeks, held for the adoration of images, and falsely called the Seventh, was condemned by the bishops." Similar language is used by Adhelm, in his *Annals*; by the Anonymous Author of the *Life of Charlemagne* in Duchesne's *Olden Writers of the History of the Franks*: by Hincmar, Ado of Vienne, Eginhard, the Saxon Poet, and many others.

sentiments of the *Caroline Books*, which we know to have been precisely their own. In Book 4, chap. 13, the author compares the Seventh with the Copronymian Synod, and says: "They and their predecessors insolently desired to convene a Synod, and to associate it with the six venerable ones, calling it the Seventh Synod. But while both parties importunately tried this thing, neither attained the object of their ambition. . . . Both the brazen coin and the tin one (1) being not allowed to make up the number Seven, there remain only Six, which are illustrated by the perfection of the number, and by the brightness of Catholic erudition." And in Chap. 28, "Among other mad things said to have been done or written in the same Synod, not the least of their hallucinations is the styling their Synod Œcumenical, when it neither preserved the universal purity of faith, nor was made up from all the churches." Nor is it at all strange that the Frankfort prelates did not concede the palm of œcumenicity to the Seventh Synod, for it had not been confirmed by the Roman Pontiff. When Pope Adrian I. answered the *Capitular* which the abbot Angilbert brought him from Charlemagne, he did not claim for the Synod any respect as a General Council; and the successors of Adrian constantly communicated with the French who rejected it, as well as with the English church, which labored under the same mistake as the French, in regard to the meaning of the Seventh Council (2). True to his theory that the Synod of Frankfort condemned, not the Seventh but the Copronymian Synod, Bini rightly asserts that these prelates would not have ventured to reject a Synod confirmed by Rome; he holds, therefore, that Pope Adrian confirmed the Seventh Synod. Now, while it is true that this Pontiff received the decrees of the Council, yet he did not solemnly confirm them in the usual manner, namely, by an Encyclical Letter to all the churches. To this fact, he himself is a witness in his *Apologetic Epistle* to Charlemagne: "According to our orders, they held this Synod, and restored the holy and venerable images to their ancient position. And as in our own.

(1) The author compares the Six General Councils to six golden coins, to which the Copronymites wished to join a brazen counterfeit, and the fathers of the Seventh Council a tin one.

(2) See Roger of Hoveden and Matthew of Westminster.

and in the *Definition* of St. Gregory, it was established, concerning images—so they avowed, in their *Definition*—to give them kisses and honorable salutation, but not, according to our faith, to give them a real *latria*, which belongs only to the Divine nature. . . . . However, we have given, as yet, no response to the same emperor concerning the same Synod, fearing they might return to their errors.” Drawing these reflections to a close, we conclude that the prelates assembled at Frankfort, like the author of the *Caroline Books*, were deceived as to the meaning of the decree on image-worship, issued by the Seventh Council, and that they rejected it, feeling themselves justified in so doing, because the want of Apostolic confirmation, on the part of the same Seventh Synod, was equivalent to a lack of binding authority. The mind of the French Church, however, in reference to the authority of that Roman Church which had just defended and sanctioned anew a relative worship of images, was very different from that which Protestant authors affect to discover. The utter devotion of that mind to the authority of the Roman See, is shown by the following passages from the *Caroline Books*, b. 1, c. 6: “Before we undertake a discussion of the testimonies absurdly cited by the Easterns in their Synod, we think it proper to show how the Roman Church was elevated by the Lord above the other churches, and how she is to be consulted by the faithful; especially since testimony is only to be taken from those Scriptures which she receives as Canonical, and since the teachings of no Doctors are to be accepted, but of those who have been received by Gelasius or other Pontiffs of that Holy See.” And having recited a passage of St. Augustine, the author proceeds: “As he prefers generally the Apostolic Sees to all others in the world, how much more is that See to be preferred to all, which was elevated above the other Apostolic Sees? As therefore the Apostles were eminent among the other disciples, and Peter was eminent among all the Apostles, so likewise among other sees is an Apostolic one elevated, and among the Apostolic the Roman. For this See was not put above the rest by any Synodical constitutions, but holds the Primacy from the authority of the Lord, saying: ‘Thou art

Peter, and upon this rock I shall build My Church.'” And then, after noting how the great St. Jerome, though consulted by Pope Damasus on points of erudition, consulted the Pontiff on matters of faith, he concludes : “ Whence we are to understand that the holy and learned men, who shone by the light of science and preaching throughout the world, not only did not leave the Roman Church, but, in times of necessity, implored her aid to strengthen their faith. Which, as we have said, and proved by examples, all Catholic churches ought regularly to do, that they may obtain aid for their faith from her, after Christ, who has neither spot nor stain, and who crushes the frightful heads of heresy, and confirms the minds of the faithful. And while many have receded from her holy and venerable communion, our church has never departed, but by her Apostolic instruction, and through Him from whom comes every good gift and every perfect one, she has ever received reverend blessings.”

From the time of the Seventh General Council, to the reign of Leo the Armenian, who mounted the Byzantine throne in 814, the Eastern churches enjoyed comparative peace. But this Emperor resuscitated the Iconoclast heresy, and those who resisted his efforts were punished with imprisonment and spoliation. With the advent to power of Michael the Stutterer, in 820, the Iconoclast hopes were raised to the highest pitch. No sooner had this Emperor crushed the seditions which troubled the commencement of his reign, than he dropped the mask of toleration at first assumed, and made open war on the orthodox. He also endeavored to deceive Pope Eugene II., and the Emperor Louis the Pious as to his real designs, claiming that he was only resisting the most superstitious of practices, and begging the influence of Louis with the Pontiff that an end might be put to religious discord in the Eastern empire. Yielding to these solicitations, Louis requested of the Pope permission to hold a meeting of bishops, at which the testimonies of the fathers, bearing on the image-question, might be ventilated. To this the Pontiff consented, and in 824, a meeting of bishops took place at Paris, the result of which

was the sending to Louis a voluminous collection of citations from the fathers, divided, as follows, into Chapters. "First, against those who indiscreetly presume to remove images, not only from the churches, but from the sacred vessels. Second, as to our course of action in regard to the images of saints and historical pictures, it is laid down by that most holy, illustrious, and wonderful man, the most learned of the Catholic Church, Pope Gregory. Third, against those who revere and adore images with an undue worship, and call them holy, and say that through them holiness is acquired, as was inserted in that Synod of the Greeks. Fourth, the opinions of the Fathers on superstitious worship. Fifth, by what authority, and with what reason, are images to be adored, and incense to be offered them, when even the angels, or holy men, when living, would not be adored? Sixth, against those who defend the superstition of images by adducing its antiquity, seeking custom rather than the authority of truth. Seventh, the saints have always taught us, by their words and deeds, to avoid all superstition, or any other thing which might cause scandal to the weaker brethren. Eighth, because some have defended the adoration of images, by the fact of Jacob having adored his son Joseph, or at least the end of his rod we thought proper to show how this is explained by St Jerome and by St. Augustine. Ninth, against those who find evidence in the adoration of David by the prophet Nathan. in the *Book of Kings*. Tenth, against those who adore images because they call them sacred, and compare them with sacred vessels. Eleventh, against those who quote the two Cherubim in testimony. Twelfth, on the worship which the Greeks call *latria*. Thirteenth, against those, in that Synod of the Greeks, who say that they adore, with like reason, images and the life-giving cross. Fourteenth, against those who adduce the Sign of the Cross as proof that it is as licit to adore images as to adore the wood of the cross." In the Fifteenth, there are many testimonies of the fathers against the indiscreet adorers of images, and the Sixteenth explains "how was originated in the Eastern church, the warfare against images." To this Collection the bishops added the

text of a letter which they wished Louis to write to Pope Eugene, and also the text of one which they would like the Pontiff to send to the Emperor Michael. In this latter epistle, they proposed as a means of peace, "That those who wished to have images in a fit place, and without any improper adoration, for the sake of pious memory and of sound doctrine, should have them; that those, however, who did not wish them, should not spurn with illicit contempt, either the images or their possessors." Louis sent this draft of letter, together with the Chapters just quoted, to Pope Eugene II., and he gave the following instructions to his envoys: "We therefore command your Carefulness, that before you say anything about these things to our Apostolic Lord, you will present the matter with great care, and extract and describe what you may find more apt to the present business, and offer it to him to read. Because, as you know, we asked his permission to have this Collection made by our bishops; and hence we cannot avoid showing him that which, by his permission, has been collected. Take the greatest pains, nevertheless, to show him such of these (chapters) as best pertain to the image question, and which he, or his, will not be able to reject. And do you reason with him so patiently and so modestly on this subject, that you may successfully avoid, by too much resistance, compelling him to fall into some irrevocable obstinacy. Rather than openly resist his remarks, be yielding to them, and thus you may lead him to the rule which is to be followed in the image-question." From all this, Protestant writers have concluded that the French bishops, in convention at Paris in 825, refused to accord images, not only the supreme adoration of *latria*, but even the relative and inferior honor which Catholics claim for them.

It cannot be denied that the language used by the prelates of Paris is very strong, and that it plainly indicates, on the part of the Western churches, a full persuasion that the Greeks of their day were exceedingly superstitious. We willingly admit that the strong language was not out of place, for there is good reason for believing that the accusation of superstition was well merited by many of the

fickle, restless, and super-imaginative Byzantines of that day. But we do assert, firstly, that this meeting of bishops at Paris was not a Synod, and that therefore its authority was no greater than that of so many private individuals; secondly, that these prelates distinctly submitted their views to the authoritative judgment of Rome; thirdly, that they did not condemn the relative honor accorded to images by the Catholic Church. The first point is illustrated by the draft of the Epistle which the bishops desired Louis to send in his own name to Pope Eugene II., and which is found in the *Acts* of the meeting: "We however, not by convoking a Synod, but, as we asked of you and obtained permission to so do, by such conference with our friends, your children, as the multifarious cares of our kingdom would allow, considered what we should present to your Lovingness in this necessity, so that the people might be restored to concord by your Holiness, preserved orthodox by God." That, secondly, the Parisian assembly submitted their judgment to that of the Holy See, is shown by the Epistle sent to the Pontiff, by advice of the prelates, by the sovereigns Louis and Lothair, "as we knew that it was our duty to furnish all the help in our power, in matters pertaining to Divine worship, to those to whom God has intrusted the government of the churches and the care of the Lord's flock, so, when the Greek ambassadors informed us of their intention to wait upon you, we did not neglect to most carefully consider what aid, with the help of God, we might afford you. And for that reason, we asked of your Holiness, that it might be permitted to our priests to search for and to collect such passages of the holy fathers as would serve to elucidate the matter upon which the same ambassadors were about to consult you. And when, according to the permission given by you, these passages had been compiled, with such care as the short space of time allowed, they were sent to us to be read. Having read them, we have sent them, by our legates, the venerable bishops Jeremiah and Jonas, to be read and examined by your Holiness. If your Paternity were to think fit, you might hold a profitable conference with these bish-

ops, concerning the legation you are about to send into Greece, as they are very well versed in Sacred Scripture, and not slightly experienced in disputation. However, we have not sent these bishops, with the aforesaid Collection of opinions, into the presence of your Lovingness, that they should exercise, as it were, any magisterial functions, or be regarded as sent to teach: but because, as we have already said, it is our duty to furnish aid, in all cases, to your most holy See." Finally, we contend that the Parisian assembly condemned, only the superstitions of the Greeks, not the relative and inferior honor given by Catholics to images. These prelates, in fact, were laboring under the erroneous impression which affected the author of the *Caroline Books* and the Synod of Frankfort, namely, that the Seventh Council had decreed to images the same devotion as was given to the Holy Trinity. They wished to put into practice the wise suggestions of the great St. Gregory to Serenus of Marseilles; checking the temerity of the image-breakers, and repressing the superstition of the injudicious and the ignorant. To be convinced of this, it is sufficient to read the following passages from the episcopal letter to Louis and Lothair: "The images of the saints are not to be broken by foolish presumption; nor are they, to the injury of the saints, to be despised and abolished. Rather should they be preserved, superstition being removed, for sake of remembrance and of love, according to true religion, in memory of those whose images they are, as Blessed Gregory explained, in a sufficiently clear and Catholic manner . . . . . your corrective words may be openly directed against those who have sent you the Epistle we have read (1), for its text shows that both factions should be condemned, that is, those who venerate the images with an undue and superstitious worship, and those who removed the same from the nearer places." And in chap. 15, of their Collection, the bishops say: "So far this is all for thee, who art an indiscreet worshiper of images; and for thee, who art their rash destroyer."

We have more than insinuated that many superstitions

(1) The bishops allude to the Epistle of the Emperor Michael the Stutterer to Louis.

had crept into use among the Greeks, in reference to image-worship. Indeed, it is only by supposing that such, unfortunately, was the case, that we can account for the extraordinary caution and strong language of the Westerns, of which we have had so many specimens. Although there is doubtless some exaggeration to be expected in such a quarter, we adduce a portion of the Epistle sent by the Emperor Michael to Louis the Pious: "Many of our ecclesiastics, as well as laymen, forgetting the Apostolic traditions, and transgressing the limits of their forefathers, have become inventors of evil things. First indeed they put out of the temples the honorable and life-giving crosses, and put images in their stead, placing lights and burning incense before them, holding them in the same regard as the honorable and life giving wood upon which Christ the True God deigned to be crucified for our salvation (1). They sang before them, adored them, and sought aid from them. Many covered them with cloths, and made them sponsors for their children at Baptism. Others, when wishing to assume the monastic habit, rejected the service of religious persons who used to receive their hair, when cut off, and using instead the images, allowed, as it were, the locks to fall into their laps. Some, even of our priests and clerics, scraping the paint from the images, mixed it with the Oblations, and from this Oblation, after the celebration of mass, communicated them who wished. Some even placed the Body of the Lord in the hands of the images, whence the communicants might receive It. Some, despising the temple, used as altars the pedestals of images in common houses, exercising the sacred ministry upon them." Bel-larmine (2) and Christian Lupus (3) contend that these assertions of Michael are foul calumnies, but the superstitious propensities of the Greeks were noted by the Dominican friar, Pantaleon, who, writing in 1252, from the Dominican convent of Constantinople, said (4). "In the church of the

(1) The reader will notice the thoroughly un-Protestant devotion to the cross, which this Iconocast inculcates.

(2) *Treatise on Image-Worship.*

(3) *Note to 7th Synod*

(4) Cited by Alexandre, *Cent. 8, diss. 6, § 10*, from the *Lyons Library of the Fathers*, v. 27.

said palace (Constantine's), where are preserved the holy relics, the image of the Holy Mother of God behind the altar, which they called the Lady of the House (of God), is immediately locked up when the Lent begins, and so kept until Holy Saturday; the doors are covered with a cloth. The same is done to the shrines of Sts. Mantelles and Koramidius. They importune the image of the Holy Mother of God, that she may cause sons to be born, and by its means, they make a sponsor of her, in this manner: A garment is connected with the image, so that she may receive, as sponsor, the child from the hand of the priest . . . . . But that the image speaks, or promises fidelity for the child, or bears witness to the baptism, who will dare to assert, unless he despises God? Omitting no kind of superstition, and hating their true brethren, they make brethren to themselves of the unwilling saints."

There are several other arguments, adduced from writers of this period, which Daillé and his imitators are fond of citing as proof that the churches of the West, during the Iconoclastic troubles, were not unanimous in giving even an inferior honor to images (1). Thus, they quote sayings from Agobardus, archbishop of Lyons; from Jonas, bishop of Orleans; from Dungal, a learned recluse of the abbey of St. Denis; and Walfrid Strabo. As the arguments already adduced in the cases of the *Caroline Books* and the two episcopal conventions, apply also to these, we may omit any disquisition upon them.

Returning now to the history of Iconoclasm, we only observe that during the reigns of Michael the Stutterer and Theophilus, the orthodox had much to suffer, but with the advent of Theodora in 841, and the election of Methodius to the patriarchate of Constantinople, the war on images came to an end. In the West, about the year 823, Claude of Turin removed the images from the churches of his diocese, and wrote against their veneration, but he was refuted by Theodemir, Dungal, and others. Before the tenth century, the 2d Council of Nice was everywhere received as œcumen-

(1) Many Protestants quote Hincmar of Rheims in their favor, but Daillé declares that a diligent inspection of the MS., from which his words are cited, satisfied him that the passage is an interpolation by the Centuriators of Magdeburg.

ical, and the respect due to images everywhere recognized. In the twelfth century, the Valdensians, Albigensians, and other fanatics, revived the Iconoclast heresy; while at the time of the "Reformation," Calvin declared the veneration of images idolatrous. At first, Luther did not wish them removed, but the friends of the *Confession of Augsburg* accused the Catholics of ascribing a certain in-dwelling power to the images themselves. In many Lutheran churches, the crucifix and certain historical paintings are allowed. Erasmus thus protests against the frenzy of Carlostadt: "Whoever deprives us of painting, deprives existence of its greatest charms; painting is often a better interpreter than language. It is false that images are useless. Formerly there were images in the Jewish temples—cherubim, and fanciful images of men and animals. The images which adorn our Christian churches are not presented to the faithful for adoration—they are either elegant ornaments or pious memorials. Do you not believe that if the scenes of the life of Christ were painted on the sacred walls, such material representations would raise our minds to the contemplation of His life? Catholics never offer images to be adored, and the respect that they show is for the saints represented. Banish, then, since you will not have images, the Atlases and musicians, whom the artist uses to support a pulpit or a pillar; yea, remove the cock which surmounts the steeple" (1).

(1) *Epistles*, b. 31, n. 50.

## CHAPTER XL.

### ORIGIN OF THE PAPAL DOMINION IN THE ROMAN STATES.

In giving this title to the following dissertation, we do so because we hold that the term "Temporal Power" is more appropriately applied to the authority of regulation and deposition which the Supreme Pontiffs once exercised, *de jure* and *de facto*, over the Christian monarchs of the earth. Few events have given rise to more bitter heart-burnings and more acrimonious discussions than those which commenced in the Papal States with the war of 1859, and culminated with the occupation of Rome by the Italian government in 1870. We do not propose to enter into a defence of the rights of the Holy See to the retention of its temporal domain; that has been done ably and sufficiently in every language of the Christian community, so that Catholics may be said to be of one mind in the matter. But our attention is claimed by the *origin* of the Pontifical sovereignty over the old Duchy of Rome and contiguous regions—as a purely historical theme, and one of great interest and importance, we cannot afford to omit it. The student of the middle ages is never surprised when he finds the subject matter of his researches involved in more or less of obscurity, and when he approaches the present question he will experience some difficulty in its solution. Modern writers have devoted much time to the matter, impelled by the audacious attacks of the enemies of Rome, but as yet their praiseworthy efforts have not succeeded in entirely dissipating the cloud which obscures our vision of the great events of the eighth century. In forming a just idea of this period, truth has been forced to contend with no ordinary passions. Party spirit and national vanity have taken the field, and thus we see French historians attributing to Pepin and Charlemagne far more influence in Roman affairs than those rulers ever pretended to possess. while, on the other hand,

Italian critics do not hesitate to detract from that praise which is really due to the Carlovingian kings as glorifiers of the Roman See. Nor, with so rich a prospect of facts for the buttressing of their tottering theories, could we expect any inactivity in those court-theologians and Cæsar-worshipers, who are perhaps the worst enemies of the Church; when these gentry go to the Rome of the eighth century, they can see there no sovereign but him of Constantinople, and in later days, they have eyes only for the Western emperor. In addition to these two classes of critics who may claim some of our respect and much of our attention, there is a third, made up of the sworn enemies of the royal dominion of the Pontiffs, in whatever shape it may be actuated, or by whatever arguments it may be defended. These men have covered the origin of the temporal domain with dirt, assigning as its causes, consummate ambition, unscrupulous chicanery, and low theft. We will now proceed to examine the origin of the Papal dominion in the Roman States, so far as the limited nature of our work will permit.

In the year 330, the Emperor Constantine transferred the seat of government from Rome to Byzantium, which from that time was styled Constantinople. The temporal influence of the Popes commenced to increase, nor did the Emperors complain; nay, they were too willing to be relieved of the weight of government in Italy. At the time of St. Gregory the Great, this power commenced to assume definite proportions; but even in the days of St. Leo the Great (440-461) it was remarkable. Before his election, Leo had been chosen by Valentinian III. as mediator between his general, Ætius, and Albinus the pretorian, whose discords were shaking the empire. It was during this reign that Attila fell upon Italy (452), and the safety of Rome was owing to the Pope's influence with the conqueror. Three years later, he in similar manner saved the city from the savage Genseric the Vandal. So accustomed had the people of Rome become to the tutelage of the Pontiff, that it was unsafe to leave them alone. Hence it was that Leo was unable to attend that Synod of Ephesus to which the crimes of Dioscorus gave the name of "Robber-Synod;" and that he could preside at

the Council of Chalcedon only by means of his legates. Thus he explains his absence, in the first case, in his letter to the Empress Pulcheria, and in the second, writing to Marcianus and the œcumenical fathers. But we find the great Gregory exercising a power more nearly approaching that of a sovereign. Thus, he sent governors to the imperial cities, made treaties with the barbarians, recruited armies, and provided Rome with fortifications and provisions (1). Sisinnius and Gregory II. restored the walls of Rome. And so the *de facto* sovereignty of the Pontiffs progressed, until in the eighth century it became *de jure*. The true reason for its exercise was the abandonment of their duties by the Emperors of Constantinople, and the spontaneous movement of a miserable people imploring the succor of a loving father (2). So gradual, and, we may say, insensible, was the transition to a *de jure* state of government, that grave and earnest critics differ as to the time when the Papal dominion reached the second condition. Among others, Orsi, Bianchi, and Thomassin, hold that at least the Duchy of Rome recognized Gregory II. as king, in the year 726, when the image-breaking Leo the Isaurian provoked the Italians to revolt. The learned annotator of Baronius, Pagi, contends that the temporal sovereignty of the Papacy dates from the year 754, in the pontificate of Stephen II., when King Pepin of the Franks signed the treaty of Pavia, after the defeat of Astolphus the Lombard. De Marca is not content with those who defer the commencement to 774, when Charlemagne annihilated the power of Desiderius, and thus solidified the rule of the Popes; he asserts that down to the year 796 the Byzantine Emperors remained masters of Rome. He who wishes to change history for romance, will postpone still further the date of the foundation of the temporal dominion. Ranke certainly styles Julius II. "the founder" of the States of the Church (3), but his context shows that he uses this term in the sense of "restorer."

(1) Book I., *epist.* 72; II., 3, 29, 30, 31, 46; V., 35, 41; VI., 30; IX., 4, 6, 42, 43; *Conf. Migne's Patrology*, vol. 77.

(2) For a full and exact narration of the gradual progress of this *de facto* sovereignty, read the *Origin of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes*, published in the Roman CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA for the year 1860. This article is probably the most correct and the most exhaustive yet written upon the subject, and we are indebted to it for much of our information.

(3) Book I., c. 2.

Ranke also asserts that the donation of Pepin was the foundation of the whole dominion of the Popes. If any one wishes to defend the theory of the revolutionary government of Bologna of 1859, in which it was claimed that the Exarchate and the Pentapolis (1) became subject to the Popes only under Martin V. (1417-1431)—according to Ranke, under Julius II.—we need scarcely notice the sophism, for such, and a pure and simple one, it certainly must be called. From the time of the donation of Charlemagne to that of Pius IX., there is a constant succession of public documents which prove that the Romagna was ever claimed by the Holy See, and that its suzerain rights were acknowledged by international law. There were often periods when the Popes lost possession of this or that part of their territory, now owing to popular turbulence, sometimes on account of the arrogance of their vassal princes, and still more frequently because of the usurpation of the Holy Roman Emperors, nearly always ungrateful to the power to which they owed their dignity. But what does this prove? Certainly not that the conquests of Cæsar Borgia and Julius II. were the foundation of the Papal rule in these districts.

A careful examination of the records of the time convinces us that the first Roman Pontiff to place upon his brow the crown of temporal sovereignty was Stephen II., who reigned between the years 752 and 757, and the precise date of the acquisition was the year 754. Many had been the revolts of the Italians against the Eastern Emperors; often indeed had the Popes been forced in charity to the people to assume the direction of affairs, but they had always begged the discontented populations "to not fail in love and fidelity to the Roman Empire" (2). The rule of Byzantium had proved execrable for its impiety, and contemptible for its impotency (3), and Gregory III. had been obliged in the year

(1) The "Pentapolis" was the collective name of the five cities, Ancona, Rimini, Pesaro, Fano and Sinigaglia. In the Bolognese official *Monitore* of Oct. 6, 1859, appeared a Memorandum signed by Pepoli and Cipriani, in which one reason for the rebellion was given thus, "During all the middle ages the temporal sovereignty of the Popes was never exercised in the Romagna. It was subjected to the Holy See only in the fifteenth century."

(2) ANASTASIUS Bibl., in *Life of Greg. II.*

(3) The following fact will show that the Exarch (imperial representative at Ravenna) had very little influence. In the year 733, occurred a great battle between the revolted Ravennese and the Constantinopolitan troops, and so great was the number of Greek corpses thrown into the Paterno, that for six years the people would eat no fish taken therefrom. This victory was ever after celebrated by the Ravennese with processions and litanies, and

739 to make his famous appeal to Charles Martel, sending to him the keys of the tomb of the Apostles, and begging him to protect the Romans from the oppressions of the then barbarous Lombards; but as yet the Papacy recognized as legitimate the imperial sceptre, and when peace was concluded with Liutprand by Pope Zachary (successor to Greg. III.) it was signed in the name of the Emperor. Even Stephen II., up to the very time when he was compelled to turn his thoughts from the East to the West, acknowledged the obligation of obedience to Constantinople, for we find him turning to the infamous Constantine Copronymus in the year 753, and entreating him to protect his subjects from the Lombards, to "liberate the city of Rome and the whole Italian province from the bites of the child of iniquity." These facts compel us to reject the theory of Orsi and others that the temporal sovereignty of the Popes dates as far back as the time of Gregory II.

Of different calibres indeed were the emperors Copronymus and Justinian. It was scarcely to be hoped that the former would effect for Italy, against the Lombards, what the latter, supported by Belisarius and Narses, had accomplished against the Goths. In the year 751, news reached Byzantium that the last of the Exarchs had surrendered to the conquering Astolphus, but the emperor was too much occupied in image-breaking to pay much attention to the loss of his fairest province, and two years passed ere he wrote to the usurper and implored its restitution. In the meantime Astolphus had prepared to verify the title, "king of all Italy," which, one hundred and fifty years previously, his predecessor Agilulphus had stamped upon the iron crown. His lieutenant, Count Robert, had vainly endeavored to capture Rome, and had lost his life in the attempt, when the order was given to devastate the Campagna. Nepi was taken, all the castles destroyed and the churches burned. Pope Stephen II., who had been elected in March, 752, then made his last appeal to Copronymus, but this was as vain as

by the decoration of the city, right under the eyes of the Exarch. Well may Muratori say that the Exarchs were obliged "to navigate as they best could." So nominal had become the authority of the Emperor, that, according to Balbo, in his *History of Italy under the Barbarians*, b. II., c. 25, the Exarch was often seen taking the part of the Pope against his majesty.

his prayers to the ferocious Lombard, with whom he tried every legitimate means of pacification. To whom could the Pontiff look for help? Nearly the whole of Italy lay at the feet of the oppressor. The Lombard hordes roved rampant from the Alps to the Volturno, Rome alone excepted; the days were gone, when the Spoletans successfully made common cause with the Eternal City against the barbarian; Venice, already ambitious of commercial prosperity, cared not to be embroiled with a powerful and probably successful conqueror; the few cities of lower Italy, whose insignificance the Lombard allowed yet to repose under the banners of Copronymus, were of no value in arms; the men of the Pentapolis were exhausted of all strength after their brave but futile struggle. In the exercise of that right accorded him by the will of the Romans, by the law of nature and by the imperial permission to ally himself with any willing defender (1), Stephen turned to the new peoples of the earth, and his prophetic eye selected the one whom we rightly call the first-born (2) of the Catholic nations of Europe.

The brave and generous Franks were at this time governed by Pepin the Short, the worthy descendant of Charles Martel and of Pepin of Heristal. The already great fame of this prince had been augmented this same year by an important victory over the Saxon barbarians, and his devotion to the Roman Church was well known (3). When Pepin received the letters of Pope Stephen, he resolved to hold himself at the Pontiff's disposal, and sent as ambassadors to Rome, the bishop of Metz and the duke Autcarius, who were charged to escort Stephen into France, as he had expressed a wish to treat personally with the French king. About this time the Emperor Copronymus sent a trusted courtier to the Holy See, begging the Pope to personally interview Astolphus and prevail upon him to restore his

(1) For this concession, see TROYA, *Diplomatic Codex of the Lombards*, no. 681.

(2) When Clodoveus or Clovis had been baptized by St. Remigius, he was the only Catholic sovereign in Europe, as the princes of Germany and of the British Isles were Pagans, while the Goths of Spain and Italy, the Burgundians, &c., and even the Byzantine emperor were infected with heresy. Hence arose for the French king the title of Most Christian, and for the nation, the style of First Child of the Church.

(3) He was bound by gratitude to Rome, for in great measure he owed his throne to the sanction given by Pope Zachary to his election by the Frankish counts. He was crowned at Soissons by St. Boniface, then legate of the Pontiff.

conquered Italian provinces to the empire. Stephen resolved to make an attempt upon the Lombard, thinking that the result might obviate the necessity of a journey into France. Accordingly, though quite infirm, on Oct. 14, 753, he set out for Pavia, accompanied by the French envoys, the imperial messenger, and a chosen body of Roman clergy and nobles. The interview took place, and resulted in the refusal of Astolphus to accede to the prayers of the Pontiff. Learning from himself the intention of the Pope to cross into France, the Lombard grew furious, but did not dare to impede the journey. The energetic pastor crossed the St. Bernard in midwinter amid much suffering, one of his suite dying from exposure.

In the royal villa of Pontion near Chalons-sur-Marne, in the same plains which had witnessed the discomfiture of Attila, met the august personages whose deliberations were to decide the fate of the Hun's successor, and to give a new aspect to history. The result of the interview was a justification of the hopes of the Pope. The king swore to grant the desires of the Holy See, and in a solemn diet afterwards held at Quiercy it was resolved that on the 28th of April (754) the forces of France should march against the Lombards. In this general assembly of the notables of the kingdom, with the applause of all, was promulgated that treaty with the Holy See which, renewed and confirmed again and again by Pepin and Charlemagne, became one of the foundations of European public law in the middle ages. In this treaty or *pactionis fœdus*, king Pepin declares: "We promise to thee, Blessed Peter, keeper of the keys of the celestial kingdom and Prince of the Apostles, and for thee, to this thy beloved Vicar Stephen, excellent Pope and Supreme Pontiff, and to his successors for all time, with the consent and will of all the subscribing Abbots, Dukes and Counts of the Franks, that if the Lord our God shall through His merits and through holy prayer render us victorious against the Lombard nation and kingdom, we will give to thee forever and to thy Vicars, all the states and duchies and fortified places of the Exarchate of Ravenna, in all their integrity, as well as everything which by the concession of the Em-

perors used to belong to the district, and which will be specially described below by defined boundaries, everything which is in any way established or found within said boundaries, which have been devastated, invaded, and subtracted, and have in any way been alienated, by the most wicked Lombard race, *no power within the same limits being reserved to us and to our successors, unless only that we may gain prayers and the repose of our soul, and that by You and your people we be styled PATRICIAN OF THE ROMANS*" (1). Here follow the boundaries of the territories ceded to the Holy See.

The expedition against Astolphus set out, and the Pontiff accompanied it. The pass of Susa was carried by the Franks, and after witnessing an immense slaughter of his followers, the Lombard king shut himself up in Pavia. But the spirits of the foe had so fallen, that Pepin soon reduced the place, and listening to the prayers of the Pontiff, accorded the defeated prince comparatively honorable conditions. Besides a rather small indemnity of war, he gave forty noble hostages for the fulfilment of the conditions of peace, the principal of which was the restoration to the Romans of the Exarchate, the Pentapolis, and all other places taken from them. But scarcely had Pepin recrossed the Alps, when the perfidy of Astolphus was made manifest. Not only did he refuse to comply with the treaty of Pavia, but he commenced new depredations, and even conspired for the assassination of Pope Stephen. The holy Pontiff, already suffering from an attack which in France had nearly sent him to the grave, was seriously affected by these misfortunes. He thrice appealed by letter to the French king, but that monarch delayed to act, perhaps because he was then dealing the final blow to the Saracens and sending them forever beyond the Pyrenees, perhaps because he confided in the ability of diplomacy to forestall any necessity of military procedure. In the month of January, 756, the Lombards began the siege of Rome, and

(1) The title of "Roman Patrician," in the olden time, was given to very few, and only for very distinguished services. Clovis had received the honor, and Pepin was anxious to bear a title which, as it then signified "Defender," would increase his consequence in the eyes of all Christian peoples. He received it from Pope Stephen on the day of his coronation by that Pontiff. He had already been anointed king by St. Boniface, but he wished to still further secure the prospects of his family, and so on July 28, the Pope performed the solemn function, conceding the same honor to the queen, Bertrada, and to the royal princes, Charles and Carloman.

it had lasted three months, when suddenly Astolphus broke up his camp and hurried towards the Alps to meet once more the advancing Franks. Forced again to shut himself up in Pavia, the perfidious monarch soon implored the mercy of the victor, who granted it after exacting a renewal of the former engagements and a large indemnity in money for his army. A new diploma was then issued by Pepin, confirming to the Pope the previous donation, and Fulrad, abbot of St. Denis, was sent as commissioner from city to city to receive the keys in the name of the conqueror, and to place them upon the tomb of St. Peter in token of homage.

These are the naked facts in regard to the origin of the Papal dominion. On the score of legitimacy, no European dynasty can show so good a record; in the history of the foundation of all other monarchies will be found either a defiance of the popular will or a shameless robbery of a legitimate claimant or a wanton shedding of innocent blood. "Like the Nile," says De Maistre, (1). "sovereignty likes to hide its head." This is true in more ways than one, but while it may be difficult to trace the precise origin of Pontifical rule, especially in the Duchy of Rome, we find nothing of which to be ashamed. The people of Rome and the Exarchate had been shamelessly abandoned by their Emperor; they appealed to their natural protector, to him who for many years had been their ruler in nearly all but name; a friendly power intervenes, ejects the usurper, and hands over the conquered territory, not to him whose imbecility, neglect and cowardice, had destroyed every claim to allegiance, but to him to whom the people principally owed their deliverance, and to whom—which should especially please those who idolize the popular will—the multitude wished the sovereignty to be given.

If the facts above related unfold the true origin of the Pontifical dominion in the Roman States, the Papal claims were founded principally, at least, so far as they depended upon written law, upon the cession by Pepin, and the justice of that cession can be deduced only from the right of conquest acquired by the French monarch. To the nostrils of most

(1) *The Pope*, b. III., c. 6.

of us this right of conquest bears an unpleasant odor ; there arise memories of Poland and Ireland which render us reserptive when it is put forward. Still, a generality should not be deduced from one or two particulars, and it should be remembered that public law does and always has recognized this right, and that in many cases it is in accordance with strict common sense. But little reflection is needed to discover one of those cases in the conquest of the Roman States by Pepin. And now for a few remarks upon the manner in which this king treated the imperial claims to the provinces which Byzantium had failed to protect.

In the preliminary proceedings at Pontion, and in the solemn deliberations at Quiercy, everything shows that the Pope, the king, and the Frank nobles, regarded the imperial authority in Rome as definitely forfeited. When the Pontiff presented his views and wishes, he did not speak as did Pope Zachary when he asked Liutprand for the restitution of Ravenna, that is, using the phrases proper to an agent of the empire. The sovereignty of Copronymus is entirely and formally ignored, and Stephen addresses Pepin in the name of an independent Italy, and in his own name, as the representative and protector of the Italian peoples. On his part, Pepin treats with the Pope as with a sovereign, his peer, or rather, he enters into obligations with St. Peter in the person of his successor. There is not a word of the Emperor or of his claims, unless indeed in one passage where he so speaks as to show beyond the possibility of a doubt that he regarded the power of the empire in Italy as at an end, because of the Emperor's own implicit abdication. This abdication he assumes as at least *de facto* from the concession made to the Pontiff, which gave him full permission to provide for the deliverance and safety of the Exarchate, etc., as he might deem best (1). Pepin's denial of the imperial claims is shown more forcibly in his treatment of Carloman, his own brother, when, fearing lest the Lombard would revenge upon his monastic brethren his own refusal to obey, the royal monk left his monastery of Monte Cassino, and crossing into France, endeavored to

(1) *Codex dipl. Longob.*, no. 681.

induce Pepin to abandon the projected expedition (1). According to Anastasius, he was met with a determined refusal, his royal brother being resolved "with his whole strength to combat *for the cause of the Holy Church of God*, as he had already promised the blessed Pontiff." And to the treaty of Pavia the subscribing parties were the Romans, Franks, and Lombards, no mention being made of any Byzantine representative. While Pepin was yet at Pavia, he was waited upon by Gregory, first imperial secretary, who begged him, in the name of Copronymus, to restore the Exarchate to the empire. The Frank angrily spurned the offered bribes, and answered that he had undertaken the campaign with no hope of human favor, but solely for love of St. Peter, and that no treasure could induce him to take from the Apostle what he had already given to him. It is plain then that at this time the imperial authority was no longer acknowledged in the Roman States. It had been spurned by the people as both inefficacious for good and accompanied by cruel tyranny. The Pope, who had ever respected it, and endeavored to reconcile the Romans to its yoke, was compelled in charity to his immediate flock, to yield to the pressure of circumstances and to recognize, in the premises, the right of revolt. The Emperor himself had forfeited all claim to the allegiance of the Romans by his neglect of the first and fundamental duty of a sovereign, the care of his people, that duty which forms the only reason of existence for any government whatever. The French nation, then the most powerful in Europe, and the most authoritative in the formation of public law, had rejected the imperial claims and given the conquered provinces to the See of Rome. The Lombards solemnly recognized the Pontifical dominion by the treaty of Pavia. From the year 754, a new era was inaugurated in the political world, and was started that long list of mitred kings, who, to say the least, have reigned more in justice and in charity, and made fewer mistakes, than any other dynasty on earth (2).

(1) *Annals of Eginhard*, an. 753.

(2) We would ask the reader's attention to the following remarks of Cantù: "The original of the donation of Pepin is lost; the act usually adduced is not genuine. But the chroni-

## CHAPTER XLI.

### TERRITORIAL MODIFICATIONS OF THE PAPAL DOMINIONS, FROM THE 8TH CENTURY TO THE PRESENT DAY.

#### *The Roman Republic, moderated by the Popes (730 754).*

From the year 731 to 741, occur the expressions "Republic of the Romans," "Republican Association," "Body of the Roman Army," etc. (1). The edict of Leo the Isaurian, issued in 730, ordering the destruction of sacred images, had produced a general revolt among the Italians, and the Popes vainly endeavored to keep the Romans in obedience to the

clergy leave us in no doubt as to such a donation having been made. It embraced Ravenna, Rimini, Pesaro, Cesena, Fano, Sinigaglia, Jesi, Forlì, Imbriola, Forlì (with the castle of Sussubio), Montefeltro, Ascraglio, Montecatini, Serra, Castel San Mariano, Bobro, Urbino, Cagli, Lucull, Agubbio, Comacchio, Narni; some even include the district from Luni to Suria, with Corsica. . . . . Some (PEISTER; *History of the Germans*, v. 1, p. 40). SPILLER; *Hist.*, v. 2, p. 86) have pretended that the donation conferred only the use of the properties comprised in the mentioned districts, and not the sovereignty, which they declare to have been reserved by Pepin to himself and his successors; or, if the sovereignty was included, it was not really transferred (SISMONDI; *Ital. Repub.*, v. 1). How can this be, when the Lombards and the archbishop of Ravenna, having quarrelled with the Pope, robbed him of his jurisdiction, and not of his properties? Again, we see the Popes appointing judges and other functionaries in the cities donated (*Caroline Codices* nos. 51, 54, 75). When Charlemagne, in 781, wished to take some ancient columns from Ravenna, he asked permission from the Pope. The Pontiffs, at that time, speak of "our city of Rome, our Roman people," knowing that they have taken the place of the exarchs. Nay, it can be proved, that, before the donation of Pepin, the Popes exercised jurisdiction, by popular consent, in many of those territories. Pepin acknowledged this, when he styled his donation a restitution. . . . . At this point historians deem themselves inevitably obliged to digress, and talk about the ambition of the Popes, about their greed of power and of wealth, about the evils which accrued to Italy because—through the fault of the Pontiffs—she did not fall entirely into the power of the foreigner. I have thought it not only permissible, but a duty, whenever history commands me to do so, to say the contrary to what mere opinion or force may wish: for I have never felt sufficient sympathy with tyranny, to deem it always in the right, simply because it is the owner of armies and of thrones. In this very matter, I am content with an investigation into the facts of the case. Behold, on the one side, the emperors of Constantinople, illegitimate successors of the ancient Cæsars, who have acquired Italy by conquest, and who have treated her like a conquered land, depriving her of her olden privileges. On the other hand, you have foreign kings (if, as some hold, they were not foreign, because they were long in possession, and because they possessed no authority in foreign parts, then the Turk is no foreigner to the Greek) who swear and forswear, devastate cities, exterminate populations, put everything to fire and sword. In front of all these, behold venerable priests, chosen by the people and from the people, who pray, write, make processions, send embassies, go in person—and all this, merely to implore peace and justice; when they raise a handful of troops, it is for simple defence. Before these three parties, desirous of preserving or of conquering Italy, I notice millions of Italians, whose destiny is to be decided, and who have been despoiled by the emperor and the kings, now praying and weeping with the Pope. How much have they not suffered under the dominion of that Greek, distant, irresolute, arrogant, a tyrant over consciences, a dominion made worse by the greed of ministers, who were obedient even to the extreme of becoming assassins. . . . . If a hope of arising out of their misery remained to the Italians, they could place it only in that Pontiff whom, for a long time, the Romans had regarded as their representative, as the defender of their rights, the only consoler of the oppressed, as he was the only person who dared to demand justice from the oppressors; that Pontiff whose very character made him just and amiable, and who caused the nations to yet venerate the Roman name, which, through the fault of others, had come to be despised. The will of a people did not then have, nor does it now have, much weight in the scales of politics; but history ought to observe, which is the cause, the triumph of which lessens the griefs and injustices suffered by that multitude of men which it too much neglects; history, at least after the lapse of ages has quieted the passions, ought to be written with unalterable justice, and ought to be cursed when it does not sympathize with the oppressed."—*Univ. Hist.*, b. ix., c. 13.

(1) *Respublica Romanorum* . . . . .compages *S. Reipublicæ* . . . . .*corpus Christo dilectum exercitus Romanus*. ANASTASIUS LIBR.: *Life of Gregory III.*

Byzantine government. Finally, Pope Gregory III assumed the direction of affairs in Rome and its Duchy, maintained their *de facto* independence against the exarch of Ravenna, and sought the aid of Charles Martel, making him Patriarch or Defender of Rome (1). The confines of the Duchy of Rome were, at this time, nearly identical with those of the modern province of *Campagna di Roma*.

*Donation of Pepin (754).*

Pope St. Stephen II. went to France in 753, begged the aid of Pepin against the Lombards, and at the assembly of Quercy-sur-Oise, was made the treaty given in the previous chapter. King Astolphus having failed in his promise to restore the territories stolen from the Holy See, Pepin besieged the Lombard in Pavia, and compelled him to yield. By this restitution and the donation of Pepin, the Popes acquired the Exarchate of Ravenna, which included the territory embracing, in modern times, the Ferrarese, the Bolognese, the Romagna, the Duchy of Urbino, and part of the March of Ancona. The Lombards retained possession of the Marches of Camerino and of Fermo, of the Duchies of Spoleto and Benevento, and of Tuscany.

*Donation of Charlemagne (774) and Voluntary Choice of the Spoletans and Anconitans.*

Anastasius tells us that the Spoletans and Anconitans, the people of Fermo and of other districts, voluntarily gave themselves in subjection to Pope Adrian I. Dom Vaisette (*Geog. Eccles.*, v. 3) holds that the Duchy of Spoleto was given by Charlemagne; Lamartinière (*Hist. Dict.*) places this donation at 778, after the death of a Frankish duke named Henry, who had received Spoleto from Charlemagne. The province of Sabina is spoken of by Louis the Compliant, as "having been accorded, in its entirety, to the blessed Apostle Peter, by a written donation of our father, the Emperor Charles." By the donation of Charlemagne, or by the will of the peoples, or by both—for these two theories are

(1) *Ibid.*, b. 2, c. 99. FLEURY: b. 42.

easily reconciled—the Holy See possessed, not only the Exarchate, between the Adriatic and the Appenines, and from the mouth of the Adige to Ancona ; but Parma, Reggio and Modena; Perugia, Spoleto, Sabina, the Marches of Camerino and Chieti (Teate); and all that part of Tuscany that lies south of the Cecina, together with the territory between the Tuscan line and the Tiber.

*Contests of the Pontiff-Kings with Roman Factions and the Emperors.*

During the tenth and eleventh centuries the Papal States present changes as varied as those of a kaleidoscope. Most of the cities and fiefs are in the hands of turbulent lords who regard themselves as independent ; the great Countess Matilda alone possesses nearly all of central Italy. In 932, Alberic was really sovereign at Rome, the Pontifical authority being confined entirely to spirituals. In 1028, the duke of Spoleto becomes a simple governor, named by the Emperor. In 1047, the Normans seize Benevento, but are expelled by Henry III., who cedes the duchy to Pope Leo IX., in return for the feudal rights of the Holy See in the bishopric of Bamberg. The Normans defeat the Papal troops who, under Leo IX. in person, try to recover Benevento, but the same Normans afterwards conquer the duchy for Gregory VII. The Pontiffs Gregory VII., Victor III., Urban II., Paschal II., Gelasius II., Innocent II., Lucius II., Eugenius III., Adrian IV., Alexander III. and Lucius III., are exiled from Rome either by factions, or by the Emperors, in the struggle about investitures. For a moment, Rome becomes a republic under Arnold of Brescia. But the temporal power grows stronger abroad. The Norman conquerors of the Sicilies, Croatia, and Dalmatia (1076), Hungary and Corsica (1079) Provence (1081). Spain (1074), Portugal (1142), Denmark (1159), become vassals of the Pontiffs and pay tribute to them. The Countess Matilda gives all her territories to Pope St. Gregory VII., but dying in 1115, war ensues between Rome and the Emperor, because of her will. In 1120, Duke William does homage to Pope Calixtus II. for the Puglia and Calabria. In 1208, the duchy of Ferrara falls into the pos-

session of the House of Este. In 1209, the Emperor Otho IV. yields part of Matilda's territories to Pope Innocent III., but this concession is soon revoked. In 1210, Salinguerra, who has seized the lordship of Ferrara, receives from Otho IV. twenty-four great fiefs in the Romagna; excommunicated by Innocent III., he receives the investiture from the Pontiff. In 1212, this Pope forces Marquard and Conrad to surrender the Duchy of Spoleto and the March of Ancona; he recovers the Patrimony of St. Peter (1), but cannot deprive the archbishop of Ravenna of the government of that city. He entirely restores the Papal sovereignty of Rome, the senate being no longer chosen by the people; he abolishes the dignity of Consul, and gives the Prefect that investiture which he used to receive from the Emperor.

*Municipal and Feudal Italy in the 13th Century.*

The Pope was, at this time, sovereign *de jure* of The Patrimony, the Campagna, the March of Ancona, the Duchy of Spoleto, southern Tuscany, the Sabina, and the Romagna; but in the Romagna, the March, and the Duchy, all the cities had submitted to tyrants who pretended to hold from the Emperor, and in reality acknowledged no superior. Even in the Campagna, many powerful families divided the political authority, and were always at war with the Pontiff. In fine, the States of the Church were a confused assemblage of independent cities, corporations, and lordships. Around Bologna, ruled the Geremii; around Ravenna, the Polenta; around Rimini, the Malatesta; around Urbino, the Montefeltri; the Sabina and the Campagna were divided among the Orsini, Colonna, Frangipani, Savelli, and Gaetani families; Bologna, Ravenna, Commachio, Imola, Faenza, Forli, Cesena Rimini, Urbino, were free cities. From Innocent III. (d. 1216) to Benedict XI. (el. 1303) the Pontiffs were nearly constantly exiled from the Eternal City. During this period, out of nineteen Popes, thirteen were elected outside Rome, and were not allowed to dwell in their capital. In 1221,

(1) This term is often loosely applied to the Roman States in their entirety, but it should be used only in reference to that portion lying between the Tiber and the modern Tuscan frontier.

the Emperor pretended to confer the Romagna upon two counts of Hohenlohe. In 1229, the count of Toulouse ceded the marquisate of Provence to the Holy See. In 1273, Philip III. gave the Venaissin and half of Avignon to Gregory X. In 1275, the family of Polenta seized upon the Romagna, but in 1278, Nicholas III. obliged the Emperor Rudolph to admit that this province belonged to the Holy See, and the city of Bologna submitted to the Pontiff. In 1281, Martin IV. named John d'Eppe, counsellor of the king of Sicily, count of the Romagna. In 1288, Nicholas IV. made John Colonna marquis of Ancona, and Stephen Colonna, in 1292, was made count of the Romagna, by the same Pontiff.

*Period of the Papal Residence at Avignon (1309-1376).*

Clement V. withdrew the lordship of Ferrara from the Venetians, and the marquises of the House of Este became vassals of the Holy See for that fief. The duchy of Urbino was restored to the Popes, in 1322. Parma was re-acquired, in 1326. In 1320, Bologna revolted, and resumed its republican form of government. In 1347-48, republic at Rome under Cola di Rienzo. In 1348, Clement VI. bought Avignon from Jane, queen of Naples. In 1353, Innocent VI. sent the legate, Alvarez Alborno, into Italy to recover all the territories of the Church. In 1376, end of the "Babylonian Captivity" at Avignon. Gregory XI. returned to the Eternal City, and finding the Lateran a ruin, he fixed his court at the Vatican.

*The Popes Recover their Influence in Italy.*

In 1392, the republic of Perugia submits to Pope Boniface IX., but, in 1416, the *condottiere*, Fortebraccio, establishes a principality and holds it for life. In 1420, Martin V. takes Bologna from the Bentivoglio. In 1440, the Venetians reduce the republic of Ravenna. In 1442, Perugia submits to Eugenius IV., but nearly all the cities of the Patrimony, of the Romagna, and of the March of Ancona, revolt, and fall under the sway of independent lords.

*Nepotism ; Alienation of Papal Territories.*

In 1456, Calixtus III. creates his nephew Peter duke of Spoleto. In 1471, and 84, Sinigaglia and Mondavio are made principalities by Sixtus IV., in favor of his nephew, John della Rovere ; Imola and Forli are given to another nephew, Jerome Riario, while Frederick of Montefeltro is made duke of Urbino. In 1497, Alexander VI. makes a duchy of Benevento, for his son John, and in 1501, he makes his son Cæsar duke of Romagna.

*Consolidation of the Papal Dominion (1).*

In 1503, Julius II. expels the Borgias from the Romagna, and from 1504 to 1506, he takes from them many places in the March of Ancona. He also deprives the Bentivoglio of Bologna, and the Baglioni of Perugia. In 1509, Ravenna, and in 1511, Parma and Piacenza, are restored to the Holy See. In 1515, Leo X. cedes Parma and Piacenza to Francis I.

(1) Cantù thus speaks of the change which, about this period, was effected in the government of the Papal States: "In accordance with the ideas of the Middle Age, so opposed to that absolutism of the State which has been introduced by the moderns, the Popes used to carry on their government in union with the people, that is, with the Roman Republic. When the Pontiffs were far away, this Republic so prevailed, that Cola cited the emperor and electors of Germany to account for their titles to the Roman people. It was the cardinal Albornoz (1353) who tried to establish a true sovereignty, after the fashion that was then becoming general ; he destroyed the petty lords, recovered the cities—glad to obey the Pontiff, rather than these tyrants—and with his *Egidian Constitutions*, he guaranteed many privileges ; taking care, nevertheless, to secure a free exercise of sovereignty, by means of a union of the provinces. These *Constitutions* remained the real public law of the Romagna, they were printed in 1472, and afterwards, with various additions. The Holy See, conforming itself to the ideas of kingcraft then becoming prevalent, endeavored to enlarge its prerogatives, while the provinces jealously clung to their own statutes: the Pontifical sovereignty remained, after the ancient manner, nominal, rather than despotic. Affairs continued in this state until the revolution of 1797, which dispossessed the Pope ; afterwards, the restoration of 1814 reinstated him. The adversaries of the temporal dominion endeavor to show that this government of the Popes used to be exercised, only in dependence from the imperial supremacy. Let us ignore all history, and accept this assertion of the royalists. But in 1804, the Holy Roman Empire had ceased to be, and all the powers that had derived from it were declared to be possessed of full authority : in the Congress of 1815 (Vienna), it was agreed that all mediate jurisdiction should cease, and that each government should enjoy full and independent sovereignty. Therefore, the Popes also became absolute masters of their State, as far as the kings were concerned. In regard to their people, the Popes should have respected the privileges conceded of old, and hitherto maintained. But these privileges had been abolished by the unlimited sway of the usurpers, accustomed to unconditional despotism ; and the restorers—enemies to history, as are all who wish to tyrannize—wished that, especially in Italy, no constitutions or written rights of the people should exist. Therefore they compelled the Pope to become an absolute king, just as they were, and it was then that the cardinal Consalvi, not adverse to the new ideas, caused the Pope to issue the *motu proprio*, which systematized the public administration under a general law, instead of the multifarious and particular ones of old ; from the centre had to issue all appointments of magistrates, edicts, financial enactments ; of all the modern ravings, only one—the law of conscription—was not actuated, and yet that one was indispensable, if the others were to be kept in force. Absolutism, therefore, was an entirely new thing in the Papal dominions, and when Pius IX. initiated and blessed the Italian movement, he protested, in the Constitution of March 14, 1848, that he did nothing but 'restore some ancient institutions, which were, for a long time, the mirror of the wisdom of our august predecessors,' and that, 'in the olden time, our Communes had the privilege of governing themselves, under laws chosen by themselves, with the sovereign sanction.' Behold one of the thousand proofs that liberty is old, and despotism new ; but to-day, all moral and political sense being lost, the name of one is bestowed on the other."—*Heretics of Italy, Discourse VIII.*

of France. In 1519, this Pontiff re-acquires Urbino, and in 1520, Perugia. In 1530, Parma and Piacenza are re-annexed. In 1532, the March of Ancona is definitively annexed. In 1597, Clement VIII. takes possession of Ferrara, the ducal house being extinct. In 1626, the duke of Urbino gives all his territories to the Holy See, viz., the duchy of Urbino, the counties of Montefeltro and Gubbio, the lordship of Pesaro, and the vicariate of Sinigaglia. In 1663, the county of Avignon is seized by the French, but is restored in 1664; again seized in 1687, it is restored in 1690; seized, for the third time, in 1768, it is restored in 1774.

*Treaty of Tolentino, Feb. 19, 1797.*

By this treaty the Papal sovereignty lost the Bolognese, the Ferrarese, and the Romagna, which were incorporated into the "Cis-alpine Republic," and also the counties of Avignon and the Venaissin, which were reunited to France. In Feb., 1808, Napoleon I. occupied Rome; and in April the territories of Ancona, Macerata, Fermo, and Urbino, were united to the "Kingdom of Italy." In May, 1809, the rest of the Papal dominions were annexed to the French empire. The Congress of Vienna restored, in 1815, all the dominions of the Holy See, excepting Avignon and the Venaissin, which remained definitively united to France.

*Unitarian Movement of 1859.*

The Franco-Sardinian war against Austria, in 1859, entailed the evacuation of Bologna by the Austrians on June 12th, whereupon the Romagna rebelled against the Papal authority, and was annexed to the Sardinian kingdom in March, 1860. In the following summer, Umbria and the Marches revolted, and after the short campaign of Castelfidardo, Ancona capitulated to the Sardinians on Sept. 29. The Papal dominion was now reduced to the Patrimony, the Sabina, and the Campagna. On Sept. 20, 1870, Rome itself was occupied by the troops of Victor Emmanuel.

## CHAPTER XLII.

### ST. BONIFACE, APOSTLE OF GERMANY.

The student who is desirous of a knowledge of the first attempts to convert the tribes of Germany to the faith is referred to the learned work of Mamachi, entitled *Christian Origins and Antiquities*, b. 2, chap. 20. Of these early endeavors we shall only remark that but little progress was made until the eighth century, when these barbaric hordes were destined to be enlightened by some offshoots of their own race, some of that sturdy Saxon stock which had hurled its barbarism against the isle of Britain, but had there attained a knowledge of Christianity and of civilization. The first Anglo-Saxon who carried the cross into the home of his ancestors was St. Wilfrid. Landing on the coast of Friesland in 675 (1), he succeeded in converting several chieftains and some thousands of their followers (2). Wilfrid's mission among the Frisians was, however, only temporary, as he was on his way to Rome to plead his cause, his zeal having exiled him from England. The first permanent missions in Germany were established by Egbert, a Northumbrian priest who had been educated in Ireland. Confining his own exertions to the western islands, he at first sent Wigbert into Friesland, but in two years this missionary returned to Ireland with a lamentable tale of failure. The hopes of Egbert were soon revived by the news that the Franks, under Pepin of Herstal, had conquered South Friesland. He thought that as Pepin was a Christian, he would second the efforts of those who aimed at evangelizing, and therefore civilizing, his new subjects. St. Willibrord, and twelve disciples from Ireland, were therefore sent, to meet with better success than their predecessor (3). So numerous were the con-

(1) This name was applied to the Germanic countries bordering the North Sea.

(2) EDDIUS: chap. 25.

(3) From his infancy, Willibrord was educated by the Irish monks of Ripon, and he afterwards studied Scripture twelve years in Ireland.

verts of this apostolic band, that Pope Sergius consecrated Willibrord as bishop of Utrecht, making him metropolitan of Friesland, with authority to create a competent number of suffragans. Swidbert, one of these Saxon missionaries, labored among the Boructuarii, the inhabitants of the modern duchy of Berg. Adelbert, a royal prince of Northumbria, had great success in North Holland. Werenfrid converted the Batavi, a tribe that inhabited the island formed by the Rhine and the Wahal. Wiro (1), Plechelm, and Otger, labored among the people of Gueldres. But none of these warriors of the cross met with that success which crowned the efforts of him who was destined to be called the "Apostle of Germany." St. Boniface, according to English writers, who seem unconscious of any possibility of doubt in the matter, was a West Saxon, and born about 680 at Crediton in Devonshire. Certain Irish writers, however, and among them the learned Dr. Moran (2) as confidently assert that the great missionary was an Irishman. Marianus Scotus, a good authority in such a matter, plainly says that he was "Irish, both by father and mother." Considering, however, that his disciple, Willibald, first bishop of Achstat, tells us in the *Life of Boniface* that the saint studied, when about thirteen years of age, under Wolphard in the monastery of Exeter, and that he afterwards completed his scholastic course at Nutselle in Winchester, we would give England the credit of his training, and regard his nationality as uncertain. Although certain Protestant authors affect to sneer at what they call the ignorance of Boniface, he seems to have acquired such knowledge as the civilized world could at that time impart; for he was appointed a professor at Nutselle, and his school was greatly frequented. As the monasteries were then the only sources of knowledge in England, it is safe to conclude that the scholastic attainments of Boniface were superior to those of most Englishmen of the day. After

(1) Irish writers claim Wiro as their countryman. Alcuin, however, styles him an Anglo-Saxon. Some Irish authors also claim Plechelm and Otger for Ireland.

(2) Moran quotes as proof the monuments published in reference to German history by Pertz, vol. 7; *Chronicle of Marianus*, years 737, 745, 762, 765; *Tentamen Vitae of St. Gall*. Trithemius, he says, also refers St. Boniface to Ireland. See *Early Irish Church*, i. 3, c. 3. Lingard, who in many other cases carefully notes Irish claims to those he regards as Saxons, makes no allusion to any doubt in the matter. See *Anglo-Saxon Church*, chap. 13. Butler is similarly unsuspicious of any uncertainty on the point. See *Lives*.

his ordination to the priesthood, he became a member of the great council of the nation: and Ina, king of Wessex, gave him his confidence to such an extent that, had he been ambitious, he might have received the highest preferments. But the spirit of the Apostolate was alive in the heart of the young priest, and with the reluctant consent of his abbot, Wibert, he set out in 716, accompanied by three companions, for Friesland. But his mission was in vain. Pepin was dead, and his son Charles was opposed by a rival, while Radbode of the independent Frisians was profiting by the opportunity to reconquer the provinces which Pepin had annexed. Paganism was again triumphant in Friesland, and Boniface deemed it prudent to return, and to await in England a more propitious occasion. Soon, however, he set out for Rome to consult with Pope Gregory II., taking with him a recommendatory letter from Daniel, bishop of Winchester. The Pontiff was so impressed with the zeal of Boniface, that he advised him to make Germany the field of his labors, and dismissed him with letters to the princes whose territories he would be obliged to cross. Arriving in Thuringia, he found many nominal Christians who yet retained the habits of Paganism, and were led by a clergy, few in number, ignorant, and irregular in morals. He at once busied himself in the work of instruction and reformation, but hearing of the successes of the Franks in Friesland, he resolved to return to the people of his first choice. For three years he now labored under the direction of Willibrord, and it was only on the discovery that this prelate designed to make him his successor in the see of Utrecht, that he fled and betook himself to the country of the Hessians and Old Saxons.

In a few years, Pope Gregory II. heard that many thousands of these barbarians had been brought into the fold, and he summoned our saint to Rome in 723. When he was fully informed as to the state and needs of the German mission, the Pontiff resolved to confer upon Boniface the episcopal dignity. Willibald says that it was on this occasion that the Pope changed our saint's own name of Winfrid to that of Boniface, by which name he is now generally

known (1). Having taken the usual oath of obedience to the Holy See (2), he returned to Hesse.

St. Boniface now set himself to the task of obtaining recruits for his little army of preachers. His letters to the bishops and abbots of England resulted in a reinforcement of many zealous assistants. "No motives," says Lingard, "but those of the purest zeal could have supported them under the numerous privations and dangers to which they were continually exposed. Bread, indeed, they were able to obtain from the gratitude of their neophytes, and the menaces of the Franks protected them from the insults of the vanquished barbarians, who refused to listen to their doctrine; but for clothing, and almost every other necessary, they were compelled to depend on the casual benevolence of their distant friends; and the fruits of their labors were frequently destroyed, and their lives endangered, by the hostilities of the tribes that still retained the religion and independence of their fathers. By one incursion no less than thirty churches were levelled with the ground" (3). In a few years were founded the great monasteries of Fritzlar, Amelburg, and Fulda, and the monks placed under the strict rule of St. Benedict. By their means, cultivated ground soon took the place of the forest, and cultivated minds were engendered among what soon began to assume the semblance of a people. Boniface did not neglect the training of women. He begged Tetta, abbess of Winburn, to send him some of her Sisters for so important an object, and so many English ladies volunteered, that he soon beheld the wild daughters of Germany under the humanizing influence of Lioba at Bischofsheim, of Tecla at Chitzengen,

(1) The saint's letters show that he used both names conjointly, many years before his consecration.

(2) The oath which was exacted, at this time, by the Roman Pontiffs, is preserved in the *Diurnal of the Pontiffs*. In the first part, the bishop swears to protect the faith, unity, and interests of the Church. In the second, he avows allegiance to the emperor, and promises to oppose treason, and to inform the Pope of any such he may discover. This second part was modified when the conversion of the northern barbarians changed the circumstances of the bishops in those parts. Thus, Gregory the Great caused the Lombard prelates to swear instead of allegiance to the emperor to contribute to all just peace between their nation and the Roman empire. At the consecration of St. Boniface, another change was made. Many of the French bishops were living in an open violation of the canons; hence Boniface swore that he would not communicate with them, but would endeavor to reform them, and failing in this that he would denounce them to the Holy See. Mosheim takes occasion of this oath to carp at Boniface, as a flatterer of the Pontiff. Where the flattery lies, he would not be able to show. The saint merely obeyed a legitimate order, and one meant for that reformation Mosheim so lauds.

(3) *Epistles of St. Boniface* nos. 91 and 92.

of Walpurga at Heidenheim, of Chunihild in Thuringia, and of Chunitrude in Bavaria. In 732, Gregory III. mounted the Papal throne; and he soon sent the pallium to Boniface, and made him primate of all Germany. In 738, our saint visited Rome for the third time, and was appointed Apostolic legate to France and Germany. On his return, he paused awhile in Bavaria, at the request of Duke Odilo, to reform several abuses; he there established the sees of Saltzburg, Freisinghein, and Ratisbon, the Pope ratifying the act in 739. About this time, he also founded the sees of Erford in Thuringia, Baraburg in Hesse (since translated to Paderborn), Wurtzburg in Franconia, and Achstat in Bavaria. In the year 751, St. Boniface took a prominent part in a most important revolution. The weak Merovingian kings of the Franks had for a long time held merely the royal title, while their "mayors of the palace" exercised the real power of the crown. Pepin resolved to do away with the shadow, and accordingly, Childeric, last of the race of Clovis, was relegated to a monastery, and Pepin hailed by the nation as king of the Franks. When St. Boniface, as Apostolic legate, was requested to crown the new king, he hesitated, but the estates of the realm applied to Pope Zachary, who had succeeded Gregory III. in 741, and that Pontiff answered that it was better that he should be king who really exercised the royal power. Pepin was then crowned at Soissons.

The thirty-nine letters which have come down to us testify to the indefatigable zeal of St. Boniface, and that he had always in view the greater glory of God. His epistles are all written in Latin, although the language in most parts of Germany was almost the same as that of the English Saxons of that day. In 754, the saint resolved upon a final effort to convert the Pagans of Friesland. Availing himself of the privilege granted by Pope Zachary, he consecrated as his successor in the see of Mentz, an English monk named Lullus. He then resigned his diocese, and Pope Stephen II. acquiescing, and confirming the nomination of Lullus, he took a few companions, and set out on his last mission. Miraculous success attended his labors, and

several thousand idolaters were received into the Church. The eve of Pentecost was appointed for their confirmation, and the open plains of Dockum fixed for the assembly. Here he had pitched his tent, and was awaiting the arrival of the converts, when a horde of ferocious infidels appeared in the plain, and by their cries showed the hostility of their intentions. The attendants of the missionary wished to defend his and their own lives, but he exhorted them to remember that this was the day they had so long desired. The entire band, fifty-three in number, of whom two were bishops, three priests, three deacons, four monks, and the rest laymen, were then put to the sword. The only plunder found by the butchers consisted of relics and books, which they scattered about the fields. Three of these latter were afterwards recovered, and preserved in the monastery of Fulda; namely, a *Book of the Gospels* written by our saint, a *Harmony of the New Testament*, and a volume containing the letter of Pope St. Leo to Theodore of Frejus, the discourse of St. Ambrose on the Holy Ghost, and a treatise by this holy doctor on *The Advantage of Death*.

The courage, zeal, and success of St. Boniface were unquestionable, and his devotion to the Holy See so evident, that Protestant writers have not as yet endeavored, as in the cases of St. Patrick and St. Augustine, to prove that his doctrine was other than that of Rome. But his evident "popery" has been productive of attacks on his motives, and even on his good name. Mosheim (1) tells us that "Boniface merited the title of Apostle of the Germans, because of his many labors for Christ, nor will a fair-minded inquirer deem him unworthy of the name. But in many ways he departed from the example left us by the first and true Apostles. To say nothing of his zeal for the dignity and majesty of the Roman Pontiff, whose legate and minister he was, which equalled, if it did not surpass, his care for the glory of Jesus Christ, he did not always oppose superstition with the arms adopted by the ancient Apostles, but frequently subjugated the minds of men by force and by fear, and even by artifice and fraud. His letters be-

(1) *History*, 8th Cent., p. 1, c. I, § 4.

tray an imperious and arrogant character, a cunning and deceitful spirit, an excessive desire to increase the prerogatives of the priestly order, and a profound ignorance of many things necessary for an Apostle, and of much that pertains to the true genius of the Christian religion." St. Boniface and his companions, according to Mosheim, were the preachers, not of Christianity, but of popery; rather than ambassadors of Christ, they were emissaries and slaves of Rome; in murdering them, the barbarous but patriotic Germans did a very natural and praiseworthy thing. The head and front of St. Boniface's offending is his popery. But what other system could he have preached? Certainly not that of Luther and Calvin, eight hundred years before its time. In the Catholic faith as taught by Rome he had been raised and trained; he as firmly held it, as did the millions of Christians of the time; it is absurd then to reproach him for teaching the same faith in the infant churches of Germany. Had he done otherwise, he would have indeed merited reproach as one false to his mission. If his letters breathe a spirit of devotion to the Holy See which appears extravagant to the colder hearts of our day, we must remember that this spirit was the very life of Christendom at that period; that in the eighth century the authority of Rome extended to more objects than it now embraces (1). As for the accusation that St. Boniface was more zealous for the dignity and aggrandizement of the Roman See than for the glory of God, all his acts go to show that he regarded the glory of God as principally increased, upon this earth, by those who obey the institutions which He founded. In common with all Catholic missionaries, he was convinced that the Pope was Christ's vicar on earth, and he could not preach the Christian religion, without inculcating respect for him upon

(1) "The Pontifical authority reached its greatest development when Europe, devastated by the barbarians, was cut up into many sovereignties, fell into ignorance and into the anarchy of feudalism, lost her customs, her laws, and her police, having for masters only ferocious and vicious soldiers, who knew no other right than that of the stronger. Of what use, in moving such men, would have been prayer, exhortation, paternal advice? Menaces and censures were necessary, force had to be opposed to force, and often one faction had to be armed to reduce another. If we attempt to judge those times by our own, if we persuade ourselves that those people could be governed as we now govern, we deceive ourselves, and all declamations based upon this principle are empty. The power of the Popes has become much more limited as things have changed, and as order has been re-established." BERGIER; *Dictionary*, art. *Popes*, § III.

whom, as upon the rock, was built the Church which had care of that religion.

St. Boniface is charged with having employed force and terror to convert the German barbarians. When Mosheim makes this accusation, one would expect some proof; for it is difficult to picture St. Boniface in the guise of a Mohammedan fanatic or of a Puritan trooper, as the German historian perforce incites us to do. Does he show us the English apostle forcing the barbarians into the Church, by means of the troops of Charles Martel? The sole protection which the Hammerer and his sons, Carloman and Pepin, gave to our missionary, was what was necessary for the foundation of bishoprics, monasteries, and schools. And where was the force of this world on that glorious eve of Pentecost, when the Friesland Pagans attacked him and his fifty-two companions, as he was about to confirm his neophytes in the faith? Some of his followers would fain have sold their lives dearly, but St. Boniface bade them meet their death as a thing long desired, for it was the gate of everlasting life. He had already said (1): "If it be the will of God, let us die for the holy laws of our fathers, that we may arrive with them at the eternal inheritance. Let us not be dumb dogs, sleeping sentinels, hirelings who fly at the sight of the wolf, but watchful and diligent pastors; preaching to the great and small, to the rich and poor, to every age and condition, being instant in season and out of season." Mosheim declares that St. Boniface made use of "artifice and fraud" to make converts; that he was "cunning and deceitful." Of artifice and fraud we can find no trace, nor does Mosheim produce any instance of such practices. If the Protestant historian designates as "frauds" the saint's veneration for relics, his preaching on indulgences, purgatory, miracles, etc., he should show us some probable ground for supposing that Boniface did not himself believe in them. This cannot be shown; nay, the saint gave the best proof of his good faith when he yielded up his life in attestation of it. If, as Mosheim alleges, St. Boniface was "imperious and arrogant," his letters ought to manifest

(1) *Epistle to Cuthbert of Canterbury.*

something of such a spirit. But while they breathe zeal and Apostolic firmness, they are full of charity and of Gospel sweetness. He was strong in defence of the sacerdotal prerogatives, and so was St. Paul: "As long indeed as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles, I will honor my ministry." *Rom. XI. v. 13.* And: "Let no man despise thee." *Tit. II. v. 15.* It is certain that St. Boniface was far less domineering in his rule over the churches of his foundation, than were Luther and Calvin towards those whom they perverted. While yet in the fullness of his strength, he appointed a successor to his see of Mentz, and went off to continue his labors among the idolaters. For the rest, the authority which he claimed for bishops was simply that which was recognized as their right by the Christendom of the time. When Mosheim tells us that St. Boniface was "profoundly ignorant of much that pertains to the true genius of the Christian religion," he must mean that the saint was innocent of any knowledge of that genius which Protestantism was yet to develop. This is certainly true. Brucker ventures to blame St. Boniface for not having taught philosophy to the German barbarians; he finds fault with the Benedictine scholars for attributing erudition to the saint, and because they praise him for founding the schools of Fulda and of Fritzlar. No one contends that St. Boniface was a great philosopher, and if he had been, the Germans of that day could scarcely appreciate metaphysics before they had learned to read. But Brucker alleges a proof of our saint's ignorance which merits more than a passing notice.

This proof of ignorance lies in the fact, according to Brucker, or rather Aventin of Bavaria, that St. Boniface condemned his fellow-missionary, the Irishman Virgil (Ferghil) for having asserted the existence of Antipodes, that is, of men on the other side of the earth. If this accusation were well founded, it is no more a proof of ignorance in our saint, than would be, in the case of Brucker's idolized Luther, his want of acquaintance with the telephone. All the ancient philosophers, as well as many of the fathers of the Church, deemed the earth to be flat. Some (1) of the latter certainly manifest a knowledge of

(1) PHILOPONES; *Creation of the World*, b. 5, c. 13.

cosmography greater than that of their time, and show that they knew that the earth was round. Such was the opinion of St. Basil the Great, of the two Gregorys of Nyssa and Nazianzen, of Athanasius, and many others. But it is worse than hypercritical to blame St. Boniface for not being seven hundred years ahead of his time in matters of cosmography (1). However, there are several points to be considered before we grant even this excusable ignorance in our saint. The author (2) of a Dissertation printed in the *Memoires of Trévoux*, Jan., 1708, proves that the fact alleged by Aventin is not certain. The only foundation for it is in a letter of Pope Zachary to St. Boniface: "If it is shown that Virgil holds that there is another world, and that there are other men under this earth, another sun and another moon, convoke a synod, condemn him, deprive him of the priesthood, and expel him from the Church." But there is no proof that this order was executed. The accusation may have been found baseless, or Virgil may have proved the orthodoxy of his sentiments, showing that his words had been misinterpreted. At any rate, it is certain that Virgil lived thereafter in the friendship of the Roman Pontiff, and of St. Boniface; that he was made bishop of Salzburg, and that he was finally canonized; all which certainly proves that he was not condemned for heresy. Again, continues this author, St. Boniface was right in his condemnation of Virgil, if that missionary held, as other Antipodarians had held, that under this world there were other men, of a different species than our own, one, that is, not of the race of Adam, and not subject to the guilt of original sin. Such a paradox would have been contrary to Holy Writ, and it was in this sense only that St. Augustine rejected the theory of the Antipodes (3). "It is true," says Leibnitz (4), "that Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz, accused Virgil of Salzburg of error in this matter, and that the Pontiff replied to his letter in a manner which showed that he greatly leaned towards the

(1) D'Alembert, in the great *Encyclopedie*, insists particularly on this proof of ignorance, both in St. Boniface and in Pope St. Zachary, to whom the case of Virgil was referred. See Vol. 1, Art. *Antipodes*. Also, Baronio, y. 744.

(2) F. Edward de Vitry, S. J.

(3) *City of God*, b. 16.

(4) *Spirit of Leibnitz*, v. 2.

views of Boniface, but we discover no consequences of the accusation. The two antagonists are regarded as saints, and the learned of Bavaria, who look upon Virgil as the apostle of Carinthia and the neighboring regions, have justified his memory" (1).

(1) "We should pause for a moment to consider, in this great man, one of those heroic lives that influence the destinies of nations. His life is a compendium of the revolution which fills many centuries. Wrapped in absolute barbarism, the Germans had been surrounded, for four hundred years, by the institutions of Christian society; bishops and monks had vainly endeavored to educate these ignorant tribes. How could the faith become mistress of these intellects enslaved by the senses? How could the faith subdue such irregular wills? Their old instincts were showing themselves in slaughter, in robbery and in carousals; after thirty Catholic kings, the Franks were returning to idolatry; the sacrifices of Woden reddened the altar of Christ; and perhaps, in a short time, there would have remained only a slight remembrance of the Gospel, as of one more fable in the Mythology of the North. Such would have been the end of Christianity, had it been left to the free genius of the Germans. The barbarians could be educated only under guardianship. Their unruly spirits would bow only to the ascendancy of a great power; such was that of the Popes, who manifested that paternal character which is derived from their divine institution; who had the strength of ideas, who were accustomed to govern, and who had the prestige of time and distance and the majesty of the Latin name. By these means the Pontiffs had mastered the Franks, and through them, other peoples. It was a decisive moment when Gregory II. dictated to bishop Boniface the oath of fidelity. Rome then witnessed the fulfillment of what she had foreseen when Alaric restored, in pomp, the sacred vessels to St. Peter's basilica; she saw her empire again extended over the nations that had overthrown it; she saw a Saxon bishop kneeling, in the name of Germany, at the feet of a Roman citizen and rising, a legate of the Vatican—a proconsul of the new era, who was to introduce, without the aid of liegions or of soldiery, the legislative genius of the old Senate among his people. For thirty-seven years Boniface carried out the designs of the Roman policy; an active correspondence with the Holy See, and twenty-four letters of Popes Gregory II., Gregory III. and Zachary, show us the fruitful docility of this great spirit. The northerners accepted the beneficent rule, imposed upon them, not by the eagle, but under the symbols of the dove and the lamb, and put an end to their four centuries of hesitancy between the Gospel and idolatry. The Apostolic legate renewed the unction on the brows of the Austrasian dukes: the Franks, confirmed in their mission, found themselves as God had wished them to be, defenders of the Church, continuators of the Romans, and an insuperable barrier to invasion. The past and the future, all times and all powers, appeared united to prepare the Catholic period of the Middle Age."—CANTÜ; *History, Documents, art. Sts. Columbanus and Boniface.*



# APPENDIX.

## CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

*Of the Roman Pontiffs, Emperors, Principal Councils, Ecclesiastical Writers, and Heretics.*

### FIRST CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i> <i>Date of Election.</i>	<i>Emperors.</i> <i>Date of Death.</i>	<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>	<i>Heretics.</i>
St. Peter's See at Rome, y.	Augustus, y. 42 Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius,	14 Denis the Areopagite. 37 St. Clement, Pope. 41 Hermas.	Simon Magus. Gnostics. Corinthians. Nazareans.
St. Linus,	66 Nero, Galba, Otho, and Vitellius,	54 68	Ebionites. Nicolaites.
St. Cletus,	78 Vespasian, Titus,	79 81	Menander. Hymeneus.
St. Clement,	91 Domitian, Nerva,	96 98	Philetus.

### COUNCILS:

Jerusalem, 51 Antioch, (supposed) 58

### SECOND CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i> <i>Date of Election.</i>	<i>Emperors.</i> <i>Date of Death.</i>	<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>	<i>Heretics.</i>
St. Evarist,	100 Trajan,	117 St. Ignatius, of Anti-	Helcesaites.
St. Alexander,	109	och.	Saturnine, Basilides,
St. Sixtus I,	119	St. Papias.	Carpocrates,
St. Telesphorus,	127	St. Polycarp.	Adamites.
St. Hyginus,	139	St. Aristides.	Valentine, Apelles.
St. Pius I,	142	St. Quadratus.	Cerdo, Praxeas.
St. Anicetus,	157	St. Justin.	Marcion.
St. Soter,	168	Athenagoras.	Ophites, Sethiens, and
St. Eleutherius,	177	St. Melito.	Cainites.
St. Victor,	193	St. Apollinaris.	Quartodecimans.
		St. Irenæus.	Marcosians.
		St. Clement of Alex-	Tatian.
		andria.	Bardesanes.
		St. Theophilus of An-	Montanus.
		tioch.	Theodotians.
		Hermias.	Melchisedechians.
		Hegesippus.	Millenarians.

### COUNCILS:

Sicily,	125 In the East,	160 Lyons, Ephesus,	Rome,	198
Rome,	140 Rome,	170 Corinth, Casarea	Mesopotamia,	198
Pergamus,	152 Hierapolis,	173 of Palestine,	197 Lyons,	199

## THIRD CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>	<i>Emperors.</i>	<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>	<i>Heretics.</i>
<i>Date of Election.</i>	<i>Date of Death.</i>		
St. Zephyrinus, 202	Severus, 211	Minutius Felix.	Noetus.
St. Calixtus I, 219	Caracalla, 217	Julius Africanus.	Novatians.
St. Urban I, 223	Macrinus, 218	Caius.	Rebaptizers.
St. Pontianus, 230	Heliogabalus, 222	Tertullian.	Sabellius.
St. Antherus, 235	Alexander, 235	Ammonius Saccas.	Patripassians.
St. Fabian, 236	Maximin I, 238	St. Hippolytus.	Paul of Samosata.
	Two Gordians, Max- imus & Balbin- us, Gordian III, 238	Origen.	Manicheans.
St. Cornelius, 251	Philip, 249	St. Cyprian.	
St. Lucius I, 252	Decius, 252	St. Dionysius (Alex.).	
St. Stephen I, 253	Gallus, 253	St. Dionysius (Pope).	
St. Sixtus II, 257	Valerian, 260	St. Gregory (Thaum).	
St. Dionysius, 259	Gallienus : the 30 tyrants, 268	St. Anatolius of Laodicea.	
St. Felix I, 269	Claudius I., Aurelian, 275		
St. Eutychian, 275	Tacitus, 276		
St. Caius, 282	Probus, 282		
St. Marcellinus, 296	Carus, 283		
	Numerian, 284		

## COUNCILS :

Carthage, 215	Arabia, 249	Antioch, 253	Antioch, 264
" 217	Achaia, 250	Carthage, 253	Rome, 268
Alexandria, 223	Rome, 250	" 256	Antioch, 268
" 235	" 250	Narbonne, 257	" 269
Rome, 237	Carthage, 251	Alexandria, 258	Ancyra (Galatia), 273
Philadelphia, 242	Rome, 252	Rome, 260	Ancyra (Syria), 277
Ephesus, 245	Carthage, 252	Alexandria, 263	Mesopotamia, 277

## FOURTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>	<i>Emperors.</i>	<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>	<i>Heretics.</i>
<i>Date of Election.</i>	<i>Date of Death.</i>		
	Diocletian & Maxim- ian abdicate, 305	Arnobius.	Donatists.
St. Marcellus I, 308	Constantius Chlor- us, 306	St. Pamphylus.	Arians.
St. Eusebius, 310	Severus, 307	Lactantius.	Photinus.
St. Miltiades, 311	Galerius, 311	Eusebius of Cæsarea.	Macedonians.
St. Sylvester, 314	Maxentius, Maximin, Licinius (East), 324	Hosius of Cordova.	Acerians.
St. Mark, 336	Constantine, 337	St. Hilary of Poitiers.	Apollinarists.
St. Julius I, 337	Constantine II, Constans, 350	St. Eusebius of Vercelli.	Collyridians.
Liberius, 352	Constantius, 361	Lucifer of Cagliari.	Priscillianists.
St. Damasus, 366	Julian the Apos- tate, 363	St. Athanasius.	Messalians.
St. Siricius, 385	Jovian, 364	The two Apollinarii.	Ithacians.
St. Anastasius I, 396	Valentinian I, Gratian, 392	St. Basil.	Helvidius.
	Valentinian II, 392	St. Ephrem.	Jovinian.
	<i>Eastern Emperors.</i>	Optatus of Milevi.	Vigilantius.
	Valens, 378	St. Damasus (Pope).	
	Theodosius, 395	St. Cyril (Jerusalem).	
		St. Gregory Nazian- zen.	
		St. Gregory of Nyssa.	
		St. Pacian.	
		St. Philaster.	
		St. Ambrose.	
		St. Epiphanius.	
		Rufinus.	
		St. Gaudentius.	
		Sulpicius Severus.	
		Evagrius.	
		St. Jerome.	
		St. Augustine.	
		St. Paulinus of Nola.	

## COUNCILS :

Elvira, 305	Neo-Cæsarea, 314	Alexandria, 321	Carthage, 333
Alexandria, 308	Alexandria, 315	Gangres, 324	Rome, 337
Carthage, 311	Palestine, 318	Rome, 324	Alexandria, 340
Rome, 313	Alexandria, 319	Nice (1st Gen.), 325	Antioch, 341
Aries, 314	Rome, 320	Rome, 325	Rome, 342
Ancyra, 314	Laodicea, 320	Alexandria, 330	Milan, 344 or 346

COUNCILS (CENT. IV.)—*Continued.*

Antioch,	345	Alexandria,	363	Milan,	380	Milan,	390
Cologne,	346	Antioch,	363	Saragossa,	380	Carthage,	390
Sardica,	347	Laodicea,	364	Constantinople,	381	Constantinople,	390
Milan,	347	Illyria,	365	(3d Gen.),	381	Carthage,	393
Cordova,	347	Cesarea,	365	Aquileia,	381	Hippo,	393
Jerusalem,	348	Rome,	366	Rome,	382	Cabarsussit,	393
Rome,	349	Sicily,	366	Constantinople,	382	Constantinople,	394
Jerusalem,	350	Tyana,	366	Sida,	383	Carthage,	394
Bazas,	351	Rome,	367	Constantinople,	383	Hadrumetta,	394
Rome,	352	Rome,	367	Antioch,	383	Caverre,	394
Poitiers,	355	Rome,	368	Nîmes,	383	Hippo,	394
Milan,	355	Rome,	369	Bordeaux,	385	Turin,	397
Ancyra,	358	Rome,	370	Rome,	386	Carthage,	397
Rome,	358	Illyria,	373	Treves,	386	Carthage,	398
Rimini,	359	Rome,	373	Zelle,	386	Carthage,	399
Achaia,	359	Valence, (Dauph-)	374	Antioch,	388	Alexandria,	399
Paris,	360	inyl,	374	Toledo,	388	Cyprus,	399
Antioch,	360	Gangres,	375	Capua,	389	Constantinople,	400
Alexandria,	362	Antioch,	377	Carthage,	389	Rome,	400
Constantinople,	362	Rome,	378	Rome,	390	Toledo,	400
Paris,	362	Antioch,	379				

## FIFTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>	<i>Emperors.</i>	<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>	<i>Heretics.</i>		
<i>Date of Election.</i>	<i>Date of Death.</i>				
St. Innocent I,	402	Honorius,	423	St. Chrysostom,	Pelagius.
St. Zosimus,	417	Valentinian III,	455	St. Cyril (Alex.),	Nestorius.
St. Boniface I,	418	Maximus,	455	St. Prosper,	Eutyches.
St. Celestine I,	422	Avitus,	456	St. Vincent c. Lerins,	Predestinationists
St. Sixtus III,	432	Majorian,	461	Paulus Orosius,	Peter Fulio.
St. Leo the Great,	440	Severus,	465	Prudentius,	Theopaschites.
St. Hilary,	446	Anthemius,	472	Cassian,	
St. Simplicius,	468	Glycerius (deposed		St. Eucherius,	
St. Felix II,	483	in),	472	Claudian Mamert.	
St. Gelasius,	492	Julius Nepos (de-		St. Hilary of Arles,	
St. Anastasius II,	496	posed in),	475	Theodoret,	
St. Symmachus,	498	Romulus Augustu-		Socrates,	
		lus (deposed in),	476	Sozomenus,	
				St. Leo the Great,	
		<i>Eastern Emperors.</i>		St. Maximus of Turin,	
		Zeno,	491	St. Peter Chrysologus,	
				Salvianus,	
				St. Nilus,	
				Synesius,	
				Gennadius.	

## COUNCILS :

African, or of Car-	Rome,	417	Antioch,	436	Constantinople,	449	
thage,	401	Carthage,	417	Constantinople,	438	Britain (Gt.),	449
Alexandria,	401	Carthage,	418	Constantinople,	439	Rome,	449
Ephesus,	401	Talepte,	418	Riez,	439	Constantinople,	450
Turin,	401	Carthage,	419	Ephesus,	440	Milan,	451
Milevi,	402	Rome,	419	Orange,	441	Arles,	451
Afr., or Carthage,	403	Ravenna,	419	Vaison,	442	Chalcedon (4th	
Constantinople,	403	Carthage,	420	Bazas,	442	Gen.),	451
Carthage,	404	Hippo,	422	Arles,	442	Arles,	452
African	405	Antioch,	424	Rome,	444	Angers,	454
Italy,	405	Carthage,	425	Besançon,	444	Jerusalem,	455
Toledo,	406	Hippo,	426	Rome,	445	Arles,	458
Africa,	407	Constantinople,	426	Antioch,	445	Rome,	458
Carthage,	407	The Gauls,	429	Hierapolis,	445	Constantinople,	458
Carthage,	407	Rome,	430	St. Albans,	446	Tours,	461
Carthage,	410	Alexandria,	430	Wilkins,	446	Rome,	465
Ptolemais,	411	Ephesus (3d Gen.),	431	Two Spanish,	447	Spain,	465
Carthage,	411	Antioch,	432	Ephesus,	447	Vannes,	465
Braga,	411	Anazarba,	433	Astorga,	447	Rome,	465
Zerthe,	412	Rome,	433	Antioch,	448	Antioch,	472
Carthage,	412	Tarsus,	434	Tyre,	448	Ephesus,	475
Jerusalem,	415	Antioch,	434	Berytum,	448	Lyons,	475
Diospolis,	415	Thessalonica,	435	Constantinople,	448	Arles,	475
Jerusalem,	416	Armenia,	435				

## SIXTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>		<i>Eastern Emperors.</i>		<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>		<i>Heretics.</i>
<i>Date of Election.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>				
St. Hormisdas,	514	Anastasius	518	Ennodius,		Incorruptibilists,
St. John I,	523	Justin I,	527	Paschasius (deacon),		Phantasiasts,
St. Felix III,	526	Justinian I,	565	Boetius		Theristians,
St. Boniface II,	530	Justin II,	578	St. Fulgentius,		Tritheites.
St. John II,	533	Tiberius II,	582	Dionysius (the Little),		
St. Agapetus,	535			Ferrand (deacon),		
St. Silverius.	536			St. Cæsarius of Arles,		
Vigilius,	537			Facundus,		
St. Pelagius I,	555			Cassiodorus,		
St. John III,	559			Liberatus,		
St. Benedict I,	573			St. Gregory of Tours,		
St. Pelagius II,	578			St. John Climacus,		
St. Gregory the Great,	590			Fortunatus.		

## PRINCIPAL COUNCILS : \*

Agde,	506	Carthage,	525	Orleans (V),	549	Braga (II),	572
Orleans (I),	511	Vaison,	529	Constantinople, (5th		Mascon (I),	583
Tarragona,	516	Toledo (II),	533	Gen.),	553	Mascon (II),	585
Gironne,	517	Orleans (III),	533	Paris (III),	557	Auxerre,	585
Epona,	517	Auvergne,	535	Braga (I),	563	Toledo (III),	589
Lyons (I),	517	Orleans (III),	538	Lyons (II),	567	Narbonna,	589
Lerida,	524	Barcelona,	540	Tours (II),	567	Saragossa (II),	592
Valentia,	524	Orleans (IV),	541	Lugo,	569	Seville (I),	599
Arles (IV),	524						

## SEVENTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>		<i>Eastern Emperors.</i>		<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>		<i>Heretics</i>
<i>Date of Election.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>				
Sabinian,	604	Mauritius	602			Mohammed.
Boniface III,	607	Phocas,	610	Anastasius Sinaita,		Monothelites.
Boniface IV,	608	Heraclius,	641	John Moschus.		Paulicians.
St. Deusdedit,	615	Constantine,	641	St. Isidore of Seville,		
Boniface V,	618	Constans II,	668	Sophronius,		
Honorius I,	625	Constantine (Pog.),	685	St. Maximus (abbot),		
Severinus,	640	Justinian II. (dep.),	695	St. Hildephonse,		
John IV,	640	Leontius,	698	St. Julian of Toledo.		
Theodore I,	642			Marculphus.		
St. Martii I,	649			Theodore of Canter-		
St. Eugenius I.	654			bury.		
Vitalian,	657			Adamnan.		
Deusdedit II,	672					
Donus I,	676					
St. Agatho,	678					
St. Leo II,	682					
St. Benedict II,	684					
John V,	685					
Conon.	686					
St. Sergius I,	687					

## PRINCIPAL COUNCILS :

Paris (V),	614	Chalons		Hertford,	673	Toledo (XIV),	684
Seville (II),	619	(sur Saone),	650	Toledo (XI),	675	Toledo (XV),	688
Rheims,	625	Toledo (VIII),	653	Braga (IV),	675	Saragossa (III),	691
Toledo (IV),	634	Toledo (IX),	655	Constantinople (6th		In Trullo, (Quini-	
Toledo (V),	636	Toledo (X),	656	Gen.),	680	sext),	692
Toledo (VI),	637	Nantes,	656	Toledo (XII),	681	Toledo (XVI),	693
Toledo (VII),	647	Autun,	670	Toledo (XIII),	683	Toledo (XVII),	694

\* The Councils now become too numerous to be all noticed in a compendium.

## EIGHTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes</i>		<i>Eastern Emperors.</i>	<i>Ecc. Writers.</i>	<i>Heretics.</i>
<i>Date of Election.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>		
John VI.	701	Apsimar, 705	St. Aldhelm,	Iconoclasts,
John VII.	705	Justinian II.	Ven. Bede	Adelbert & Clement.
Sisinnius.	708	Philippicus.	711 St. John Damascene,	Elipand of Toledo,
Constantine,	708	Anastasius II.	713 Alcuin.	and Felix of Urgel,
St. Gregory II.,	715	Leo the Isaurian.	716 St. Paulinus of	
Gregory III.,	731	Copronimus	741 Aquileia,	
St. Zachary.	741	Leo IV.	Etherius.	
Stephen II. (often not		Constantine VI.	775 Beatus.	
counted, as he died be-			780 Paul (deacon),	
fore consecration),	752		797 Theophanes,	
Stephen III.,	752		Ambrose Autpertus,	
St. Paul I.,	757	<i>Revival of Western</i>		
Stephen IV.,	768	<i>Empire.</i>		
Adrian I.,	772	Charlemagne pro-		
St. Leo III.,	795	claimed emperor by		
		Pope St. Leo III, Dec.		
		25, 799, but as the		
		year was then count-		
		ed from Christmas,		
		this event is generally		
		placed in 800.		

## PRINCIPAL COUNCILS:

Germanic, held ac-	Lestines,	744 Verneuil,	755 Constantinople, (7th.
cording to some, at	Soissons,	745 Compiègne,	Gen.)
Ratisbon; according	Cloveshoe	747 Bavariau, at Dingol-	Frankfort,
to others, at Augs-	Verberie,	753 viaga,	771 Friuli,
burg,	742		797



# CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

## CENT. I.—VIII.

CHAP.	PAGE.
I. The Roman Pontificate of St. Peter the Apostle. - - -	1
II. The Heresies of the First Three Centuries. - - -	26
III. The First Persecutions of the Church. - - -	41
IV. The Rapid Propagation of Christianity a Proof of its Divinity.	59
V. Ecclesiastical Writers of the First Century. - - -	67
VI. The Conversion of Gaul, and the Question of the Areopagite. -	85
VII. The Discipline of the Secret. - - - - -	96
VIII. The Controversy Regarding the Paschal Time. - -	105
IX. The Controversy Regarding the "Fallen" during Persecution.	120
X. The Novatian Schism. - - - - -	127
XI. The Controversy on the Repetition of Baptism. - -	132
XII. Paul of Samosata. - - - - -	143
XIII. The Conversion and Baptism of Constantine. - - -	150
XIV. Canonical Penance and Auricular Confession. - -	160
XV. The Institution of Sacred Rites. - - - - -	166
XVI. Julian the Apostate. - - - - -	178
XVII. The Donatists. - - - - -	187
XVIII. Arianism, and the Council of Nice. - - -	196
XIX. The Council of Sardica. - - - - -	209
XX. The Alleged Heresy of Pope Liberius. - - - -	220
XXI. The Council of Rimini. - - - - -	233
XXII. The Second Gen. Council—First of Constantinople. - -	240
XXIII. The Appeal of St. John Chrysostom to Pope St. Innocent I. -	246
XXIV. Pelagianism. - - - - -	253
XXV. African Appeals to the Holy See. - - - - -	264
XXVI. Nestorianism and the Council of Ephesus—Third General.	276
XXVII. The Faith Preached by St. Patrick. - - - -	289
XXVIII. Eutychianism, and the Council Chalcedon—Fourth General. -	329
XXIX. The Acaecian Schism. - - - - -	344
XXX. The Conciliar Judgment in the Case of Pope Symmachus.	351

CHAP.	PAGE.
XXXI. Controversy of the "Three Chapters," and Fifth Gen. Council.	359
XXXII. The Pontificate of St. Gregory the Great. - - -	380
XXXIII. The Conversion of England. - - - - -	395
XXXIV. Monothelitism, and the Sixth Gen. Council. - -	419
XXXV. The Alleged Heresy of Pope Honorius. - - -	432
XXXVI. The Trullan Synod. - - - - -	449
XXXVII. Islamism. - - - - -	454
XXXVIII. The Paulician Heresy. - - - - -	463
XXXIX. The Iconoclast Heresy, and the Seventh Gen. Council. -	466
XL. Origin of the Papal Dominion in the Roman States. -	501
XLI. Territorial Modifications of the Papal Dominions. - -	512
XLII. St. Boniface, Apostle of Germany. - - -	519
APPENDIX: Chronological Tables, showing the Roman Pontiffs, Emperors, Councils, Ecclesiastical Writers, and Heresies, during Centuries I.-VIII. - - - - -	531








BW912 .P26 v.1  
Studies in church history,

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00015 8396